

# **Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure**

***Criteria and Procedures for the  
Department of Engineering Education (EED)***

***OAA approved December 9, 2025***

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Preamble.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Department of Engineering Education Mission .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Definitions.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.1. Committee of Eligible Faculty .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty .....	6
3.1.2. Professional Practice Faculty .....	6
3.1.3 Research Faculty .....	7
3.1.4 Associated Faculty.....	7
3.1.5 Conflicts of Interest.....	8
3.1.6 Minimum Composition .....	8
<b>3.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.3. Quorum.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.4. Voting and Recommendation .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. Appointments.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1. Criteria .....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty .....	11
4.1.2. Professional Practice Faculty .....	12
4.1.3. Research Faculty .....	14
4.1.4. Associated Faculty.....	15
4.1.5. Regional Campus Faculty .....	17
4.1.6. Emeritus Faculty.....	17
4.1.7 Joint Appointments.....	18
4.1.8 Courtesy Appointments .....	18
<b>4.2. Procedures .....</b>	<b>19</b>
4.2.1. Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	20
4.2.2. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	20
4.2.3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	21
4.2.4. Transfer from the Tenure-Track .....	21
4.2.5. Transfer from another TIU .....	21
4.2.6. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	22
4.2.7. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty on Regional Campuses.....	22
4.2.8. Joint Appointments for Faculty.....	23
4.2.9. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	23
<b>5. Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5.1. Approximate Timeline .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5.2. Required Documentation .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>5.3. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....</b>	<b>26</b>
5.3.1 Fourth Year Review .....	27
5.3.2 Extension of the Tenure Clock .....	28

<b>5.4. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5.5. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....</b>	<b>29</b>
5.5.1 Professional Practice Faculty Penultimate Year Review .....	30
<b>5.6. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....</b>	<b>30</b>
5.6.1 Research Faculty Penultimate Year Review .....	31
<b>5.7. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5.8. Regional Campus Faculty .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5.9. Salary Recommendations.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>6. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>6.1. Definitions.....</b>	<b>34</b>
6.1.1. Teaching and Mentoring.....	34
6.1.2. Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work .....	34
6.1.3. Service .....	34
<b>6.2. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion .....</b>	<b>34</b>
6.2.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	35
6.2.2. Promotion to Professor.....	36
6.2.3. Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty .....	37
6.2.4. Promotion of Research Faculty.....	39
6.2.5. Associated Faculty.....	41
6.2.6. Regional Campus Faculty .....	42
<b>6.3. Procedures &amp; Approximate Timeline .....</b>	<b>43</b>
6.3.1. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, Research, and Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	44
6.3.2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	54
6.3.3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty .....	54
6.3.4. External Evaluations.....	54
<b>7. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>8. Seventh Year Review .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>9. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....</b>	<b>57</b>
9.1. Student Evaluation of Teaching .....	57
9.2. Peer Review of Teaching.....	58
<b>Appendix: Associated Faculty Reclassifications to Professional Practice Faculty.....</b>	<b>60</b>

## 1. Preamble

This document supplements general descriptions of appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) criteria, procedures, and documentation outlined in the [Rules of the University Faculty](#) (specifically [Chapter 6: Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure](#) and [Chapter 7: Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Clinical/Teaching/Practice and Research Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Non-reappointment, and Promotion](#)), [Office of Academic Affairs \(OAA\) Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

The Department of Engineering Education (EED) will follow changes to rules and policies made by the college and/or university until such time as the department can update this document to reflect the changes. This document must be reviewed, reaffirmed, or revised at least every (4) years on appointment or reappointment of the EED Chair. New versions, reaffirmations, or minor revisions must be reviewed by EED faculty and approved by the College of Engineering (COE) Dean and OAA before it may be implemented.

This document sets forth EED's mission in alignment with the approved department strategic plan, which is framed in context by the missions, criteria, and procedures for faculty appointments, and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards (including salary increases) of COE and the university. Approval from the COE Dean and OAA means they accept the mission and criteria of EED and delegate to EED the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

For the purposes of this document, EED faculty include tenured/tenure-track, professional practice, research, associated faculty with compensated full-time equivalents (FTEs) of at least 50% in the department, and faculty that hold partial FTE positions in more than (1) department (jointly appointed faculty). The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#). 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 EED and COE; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

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

## 2. Department of Engineering Education Mission

EED creates and shares foundational, student-centered engineering education practices and scholarship that influence the broader ecosystem and transform the existing knowledge of engineering education. EED faculty prioritize: 1) promoting teaching and learning excellence through evidence-based, pedagogical approaches and training practices; 2) growing as a hub of innovative and vibrant engineering education scholarship; 3) fostering an environment that effectively supports fairness, accessibility, health, well-being, psychological safety, and sense of belonging; and 4) growing existing and establishing new partnerships. This mission is set forth in alignment with the University [Shared Values](#) and the [COE Strategic Plan](#).

### 3. Definitions

#### 3.1. Committee of Eligible Faculty

The primary purpose of the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) is to provide faculty perspective on appointment, promotion, and tenure matters. In some cases, the provided perspective serves as a recommendation to the Department Chair. The CEF for all appointment (hiring), reclassification, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in EED.

The committee composition varies depending on the role and rank being reviewed. A summary of the committee composition for role and rank is presented in Tables 1 and 2. The EED Chair, COE Dean, COE Assistant and Associate Deans, University Executive Vice President and Provost, and University President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reclassification, reappointment, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

Table 1: CEF composition for initial appointment of different faculty roles.

<b>CEF COMPOSITION</b>	
<b>Faculty Role</b>	<b>Eligible Faculty</b>
Tenure-track	All tenured/tenure-track faculty
Professional Practice	All tenured/tenure-track and professional practice faculty
Research	All tenured/tenure-track and research faculty
Associated (Senior Lecturer rank review only)	All tenured/tenure-track faculty, all non-probationary professional practice faculty, and all Senior Lecturers

Table 2: CEF composition for reappointment, promotion, and tenure reviews.

<b>CEF COMPOSITION</b>	
<b>Faculty Role</b>	<b>Eligible Faculty</b>
Tenured Professor	All Tenured Professors
Tenured Associate Professor	All Tenured Professors and Associate Professors
Tenure-track Assistant Professor	All Tenured Professors and Associate Professors
Professional Practice Professor	All Tenured Professors All non-probationary Professional Practice Professors
Professional Practice Associate Professor	All Tenured Professors and Associate Professors All non-probationary Professional Practice Professors and Professional Practice Associate Professors
Professional Practice	All Tenured Professors and Associate

Assistant Professor	Professors All non-probationary Professional Practice Professors and Professional Practice Associate Professors
Research Professor	All Tenured Professors and Research Professors
Research Associate Professor	All Tenured Professors and Associate Professors All non-probationary Research Professors and Research Associate Professors
Research Assistant Professor	All Tenured Professors & Associate Professors All non-probationary Research Professors & Research Associate Professors
Senior Lecturer (promotion only)	All Tenured Professors & Associate Professors All non-probationary Professional Practice Professors and Associate Professors All Senior Lecturers
Lecturer	Not applicable

### 3.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

#### Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured/tenure-track faculty in EED for an appointment (hiring) review of an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.
- **Rank Review.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured/tenure-track faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

#### Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- **Assistant Professors (Pre-Tenure.)** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors for the reappointment, tenure reviews, and promotion and tenure reviews of probationary professors.
- **Associate Professor and Professors (Post-Tenure.)** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured Professors for the promotion reviews of Associate professors.

### 3.1.2. Professional Practice Faculty

#### Initial Appointment and Reclassification Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured/tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the department an appointment (hiring) review of a Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.

- **Rank Review.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

### **Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

- **Professional Practice Assistant Professors.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors, and all non-probationary Professional Practice Associate Professors and Professional Practice Professors.
- **Professional Practice Associate Professors and Professional Practice Professors.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors, and all non-probationary professional practice professors.

### **3.1.3 Research Faculty**

#### **Initial Appointment and Reclassification Reviews**

- **Appointment Review.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured/tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

#### **Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

- **Research Assistant Professors.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors and all non-probationary Research Associate Professors and Professors.
- **Research Associate Professors and Research Professors.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary research professors.

### **3.1.4 Associated Faculty**

#### **Initial Appointment**

- **Appointment Review.** The initial appointment of compensated associated faculty is made by the Department Chair based on recommendations from the search committee, and the respective program director in the candidate's area of teaching. A vote of the eligible faculty is not required for those starting in compensated associated faculty roles.
- **Rank Review.** Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty, which consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, all non-probationary professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all senior lecturers within the same contract type as the candidate in the department for compensated associated faculty starting at the rank of Senior Lecturer.

#### **Reappointment**

- The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Assistant/Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies and Learning Infrastructure, the respective program director, and/or course coordinator in the candidate's area of teaching. A vote of the eligible faculty is not required for reappointment of compensated associated faculty.

### Promotion Reviews

- **Senior Lecturer.** The eligible faculty consists of all tenured/tenure-track faculty, all non-probationary professional practice faculty, and all senior lecturers within the same contract type as the candidate.
- **Tenure-track Faculty with Service at 49% FTE or Below.** The eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section 3.1.2.

### 3.1.5 Conflicts of Interest

A conflict of interest (COI) associated with initial appointment, reclassification, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews can occur within the search committee or the CEF.

#### Search Committee

A member of a Search Committee with a COI must disclose the COI to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process. COIs include the committee member:

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

#### Committee of Eligible Faculty

A member of the eligible faculty with a COI must disclose the COI to the Search Chair or P&T Committee Chair and is expected to withdraw from any reviews, meetings, or votes for the candidate. COIs include instances when the candidate is:

- 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 the candidate's 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 with the candidate, such as a spouse, child, sibling, 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.

### 3.1.6 Minimum Composition

The Department Chair, after consulting with the COE Dean, will appoint additional faculty members from another COE department if the department does not have at least three (3) eligible faculty members who can participate in a review. For example, faculty outside of EED will be invited to participate in reviews for promotion to Professor with tenure if EED does not have three (3) faculty currently at the rank of Professor with tenure and who are not currently on a leave. When appropriate, one of the additional faculty members appointed by the Department Chair may have a TIU outside of COE.

## 3.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee

Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee is a standing committee that supports the promotion and tenure of faculty within the department. The P&T Committee assists the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) in managing personnel, promotion, and tenure cases. Specific responsibilities of the P&T Committee can be found in [Section 6](#).

The committee consists of three (3) members who must hold the rank of Tenured Professor or Associate Professor, one (1) non-probationary professional practice faculty member at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professional Practice Professor, one (1) research faculty member at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor (if available), and one (1) associated faculty representative at the rank of Senior Lecturer. Members of the committee in tenure track positions engage in all cases. Members of the committee in non-tenure-track positions will engage when considering cases involving professional practice faculty, research faculty, and/or associated faculty. The P&T committee for a given case must include a minimum of three (3) faculty who are eligible to review for a given rank (Table 3).

Table 3: P&T committee composition for different rank reviews.

P&T COMMITTEE COMPOSITION	
Rank Under Review	Eligible Faculty
Tenured Professor	Tenured Professor
Associate Professor	Tenured Professor Tenured Associate Professor
Professional Practice Professor	Tenured Professor Professional Practice Professor
Professional Practice Associate Professor	Tenured Professor Tenured Associate Professor Professional Practice Professor Professional Practice Associate Professor
Research Professor	Tenured Professor Research Professor

Associate Research Professor	Tenured Professor Tenured Associate Professor Research Professor Research Associate Professor
Senior Lecturer	Tenured Professor, Associate Professor Professional Practice Professor, Associate Professor

The committee's Chair and membership are appointed by the Department Chair. The term of service is three (3) years, with reappointment possible.

### 3.3 Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds (2/3) of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest ([Section 3.3.8](#)) are not counted when determining quorum.

### 3.4 Voting and Recommendation

Votes taken on personnel matters will include "yes," "no," and "abstain" options. Abstentions are allowed but are not included in the count of votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

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

The result of the vote becomes the recommendation by the CEF to the Department Chair who will use this recommendation as part of their own responsibilities embedded within these processes. The resulting recommendation denotes the suitability of a candidate for the new appointment, reclassification, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure. The vote does not compare candidates as part of an open search.

A positive recommendation from the CEF for a new appointment or reclassification is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. In the case of candidates being considered for appointments with partial FTEs in more than one (1) department (jointly appointed faculty), the requirements for a positive recommendation are determined independently by each tenure-initiating unit (TIU) to which the candidate will be appointed.

A positive recommendation from the CEF for reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure is secured when a simple majority (> 50%) of the votes cast are positive. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, a positive recommendation is determined by the TIU holding the

primary (majority) appointment and defined by the APT document of that TIU. For joint hires, a representative of the secondary TIU may be present in the discussion of the CEF in the primary TIU as a resource in understanding aspects of a candidate's dossier that might not conform to the primary TIU model or that might reflect a hiring memorandum of understanding (MOU) concerning the candidate's responsibilities.

## 4. Appointments

### 4.1. Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department consistent with the mission. Important considerations depending on the faculty role include the individual's record to date in teaching, scholarship, and service; the potential for professional growth; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. Offers will not be extended if the search process does not yield one (1) or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued.

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 for faculty recruitment (see Section IV.B).

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

#### 4.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) and Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#).

Tenure-track faculty members are referred to as Assistant, Associate, or Professor. A tenure-track faculty member must have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in engineering, engineering education, or relevant field of study. They must demonstrate excellence through verbal and written communication; an attitude conducive with good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, collegial, ethical, and constructive fashion; and a desire to achieve tenure and advance through the tenure-track faculty ranks. Appointees will also have demonstrated excellence or strong potential to help the department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation through:

- scholarship, associated primarily with enhancing engineering education;
- teaching, including classroom teaching and student advising;
- service and leadership to the profession and university, including EED and COE;

They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in the department's Pattern of Administration document.

**Instructor.** Appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of an Assistant Professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three (3) years. Promotion to Assistant Professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. The third year is a terminal year of employment when an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor by the end of the third year of appointment (Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)). Upon promotion to Assistant Professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an Instructor. This request must be approved by the EED CEF for Assistant Professor appointments, Department Chair, COE Dean, and OAA. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

**Assistant Professor.** Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service ([Section 5.3.2](#)). Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the P&T Committee (or the equivalent body of the primary TIU where the faculty has a joint appointment) determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires OAA approval, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment.

**Associate Professor and Professor.** Appointments at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of Associate Professor is appropriate only under unique circumstance, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience, is transitioning from a non-tenure track role, or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to (4) years is possible, with approval from OAA. Review for tenure would occur in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

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

#### 4.1.2. Professional Practice Faculty

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

Professional practice faculty members are referred to as Professional Practice Instructor, Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Professional Practice Associate Professor, or Professional Practice Professor. A professional practice faculty member must have an earned master's degree in engineering, engineering education, or relevant field of study. A doctorate or other terminal degree are preferred but not mandatory if the faculty member has relevant professional experience in academia or industry. They must demonstrate excellence through verbal and written communication; an attitude conducive with good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, collegial, ethical, and constructive fashion; and a desire to advance through the practice faculty ranks. Appointees will also have demonstrated excellence or strong potential to help the department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation through:

- scholarship, typically based on applying their expertise and professional experience to course or curriculum development and/or scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL);
- teaching, including classroom teaching and student advising;
- service and leadership to the profession and university, including EED and COE;

Professional practice faculty members at the ranks of Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Professional Practice Associate Professor, or Professional Practice Professor may emphasize primary engagement in classroom teaching, research mentoring, relationships with industry to enhance problem-based and entrepreneurial minded learning, academic program leadership, and engagement with external communities or professional practice. Their primary contributions to engineering education scholarship should align or combine expectations from one (1) of two (2) pathways: teaching or practice.

1. Teaching Pathway: Expertise and experience in engineering education, including previous academic employment involving teaching, indicating advanced knowledge and capability in the appointee's area of specialization within education relevant to engineering; documented contributions in areas of education; and academic expertise and experience applied to scholarship in engineering education or academic fields related to departmental programs.
2. Practice Pathway: Expertise and experience in relevant professional and academic settings, including previous employment involving professional practice, indicating advanced knowledge and capability in the appointee's area of specialization within engineering or academic fields related to departmental programs; and contributions and experience outside of the engineering education academic field applied to academic program development involving professional practice and related practices that directly engage students.

Professional practice faculty members are primarily expected to develop, enhance, and teach courses within (1) of the programs offered by EED (e.g., engineering foundations, engineering technical communications, multidisciplinary design capstone, and integrated business and engineering). In addition, practice faculty are expected to contribute to engineering education through some combination of scholarship, course or curriculum development, leadership, and/or other service.

They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in the department's Pattern

of Administration document.

**Professional Practice Instructor.** Appointment is normally made at the rank of Professional Practice Instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three (3)-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of Professional Practice Assistant Professor by the end of the year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

**Professional Practice Assistant Professor.** Initial appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Assistant Professor is probationary for a period of five (5) years. Reappointment is considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts are non-probationary and must be for a period of at least three (3) years and for no more than (5) years. A formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period if the department wishes to consider contract renewal. Faculty may request an informal review by colleagues at any time prior to the formal review.

**Professional Practice Associate Professor and Professional Practice Professor.** Appointments at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professional Practice Professor require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in teaching and some combination of scholarship, curriculum development, leadership, or other service, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience. First contracts for initial appointments at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor and Professional Practice Professor are probationary. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice associate professors are non-probationary and must be for a period of at least three (3) years and for no more than five (5) years. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice professors are non-probationary and must be for a period of at least three (3) years and no more than eight (8) years. Tenure is not granted to professional practice faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

#### 4.1.3. Research Faculty

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

Research faculty members are referred to as Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor. A research faculty member must have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in engineering, engineering education, or relevant field of study. They must demonstrate excellence through verbal and written communication; an attitude conducive with good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, collegial, ethical, and constructive fashion; and a desire to advance through the research faculty ranks. Appointees will also have demonstrated excellence or strong potential to help the department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation through:

- scholarship, associated primarily with enhancing engineering education;
- service and leadership to the profession, including EED and COE

They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in the department's Pattern of Administration document.

**Research Assistant Professor.** Initial appointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor entails a one (1) to five (5)-year contract. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Subsequent contracts are non-probationary. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period.

**Research Associate Professor and Research Professor.** Appointments at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in scholarship, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience. First contracts for initial appointments at the rank of Associate Research Professor and Research Professor are probationary. Second and subsequent contracts for Research Associate Professors are non-probationary. All research faculty contracts are for a period of at least one year and for no more than five years. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

#### 4.1.4. Associated Faculty

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

Associated faculty are persons with lecturer titles and visiting titles. Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than 50% service to the university are also associated faculty members. Persons with tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty titles with FTEs of 50% or more may not hold associated titles. Persons holding associated titles are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty. Persons with associated titles are permitted to participate in college governance and department governance as per the EED Pattern of Administration. Associated faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of three (3) consecutive years, with the exception of visiting titles, which may not exceed a total of three (3) years ([Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#)).

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one (1) or more courses, or up to three (3) years when a longer contract is appropriate for the qualifications or contributions of the faculty member.

Associated faculty will typically have a Master's degree or a doctoral degree in engineering, engineering education, or a closely allied discipline appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization (e.g., technical communications). In the absence of a graduate degree, associated faculty will have at a minimum an undergraduate degree in engineering, engineering education, or a closely allied discipline appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization plus a minimum of three (3) years of experience: (a) teaching in the appointee's area of specialization, (b) professional work experience in the appointee's area of specialization, or (c) combination of teaching and professional work experience.

The majority of associated faculty in the EED are either full-time Lecturers or Senior Lecturers. Some associated faculty may hold part-time positions (less than 75% FTE) and others may be hired to support the unit for a single semester or a course load less than full-time. An appointee to a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer position will have strong potential to help the department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, through:

- a potential for or demonstrated excellence in teaching;
- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication; and
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, collegial, ethical, and constructive fashion.

They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in the department's Pattern of Administration document.

### **Lecturer**

The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years. All continuing Lecturer positions are subject to satisfactory annual evaluation. Second and subsequent contracts will be based on performance during the prior contract. The department will aim to extend three (3) year renewal contracts to those with satisfactory performance when possible. There should be no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank.

### **Senior Lecturer**

The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years. Subsequent contracts will be based on performance during the prior contract. The department will aim to extend three (3) year renewal contracts to those with satisfactory performance when possible. There should be no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

Criteria for direct appointments at the rank of senior lecturer are consistent with the criteria for promotion to that rank, as discussed in [Section 6.2.5](#). It is expected that appointees meet one (1) of the following criteria equating to achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment:

- 7+ years of industry experience in a field relevant to the appointee's area of expertise;
- 5+ years of experience in secondary or post-secondary teaching in the appointee's area of expertise; and/or
- 5+ years of combined experience from industry and teaching as previously described.

### **Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor**

An appointee to positions of visiting assistant professor, visiting associate professor, or visiting professor will have demonstrated potential to help the department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation. 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 (3) consecutive years at 100% FTE.

#### **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor with FTE below 50%**

Tenure-track title appointments can be made for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1-49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

#### **4.1.5. Regional Campus Faculty**

Regional campus faculty can be appointed to tenure-track and professional practice titles within the department. Regional campus criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor as well as the professional practice ranks of Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Professional Practice Associate Professor, and Professional Practice Professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty with relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality. Candidates must be involved in recognized scholarly activity appropriate to the discipline of engineering education. All efforts should align with the mission of the regional campuses, which emphasizes undergraduate instruction. Quality of scholarship from regional campus appointments is expected to be comparable to that of Columbus appointments.

#### **4.1.6. 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 (60) or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five (25) or more years of service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department Chair (Regional Campus Dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type ([3.1.1](#), [3.1.2](#), [3.1.3](#), and [3.1.4](#)) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate, submit the request to the Dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

Emeritus faculty members in EED have the following perquisites:

- Emeritus complimentary parking (application provided by the BOT)

- Emeritus permanent university ID card permitting library privileges
- Continuing use of OSU e-mail account (requested by calling the Office of Information Technology's Help Line at 614-688-4357)
- Reduced membership fee offered by the Faculty Club
- Use of recreational facilities on same basis as university faculty
- Athletic tickets, including football ticket applications, offered by the Department of Athletics at university faculty prices
- Emeritus faculty are eligible to receive campus-wide news publications issued by the university
- Use of hotel contracts and car rental contracts with OSU/Big Ten

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

If an emeritus faculty member is employed by the department, e.g., teaching one (1) or more courses, then the emeritus faculty member is an associated faculty member. Emeritus faculty members who are not employed by the department will not:

- be allocated office space, secretarial support, office supplies, or computer use, either at retirement or anytime thereafter
- participate in meetings involving personnel decisions
- Attend or participate in department faculty and staff meetings or committee meetings
- be included in the departmental faculty-staff listserv
- have access to departmental files or shared folders

#### 4.1.7 Joint Appointments

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

#### 4.1.8 Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments are no-salary, 0% FTE joint appointments for Ohio State faculty (tenure-track, professional practice, research, or associated faculty) from other tenure-initiating units. Candidates for such appointments will have significant experience in their areas of expertise and will be ready and able to engage effectively with the department's faculty in activities that help the department achieve its mission and enhance its quality and reputation. Appropriate active involvement includes scholarly collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

## 4.2. Procedures

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

The SHIFT (Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent) Framework was designed to identify and recruit broad, qualified applicant pools of extraordinary scholars who are leaders in their respective fields. Deans, TIU heads, and search committee members work in partnership with the Office of Faculty Affairs and other key stakeholders in adherence to this framework to ensure a thorough, fair, and consistent faculty search process. The framework consists of four distinct phases—each of which includes a series of core requirements (must-do action steps) and optimal practices (aspirational action steps)—followed by a fifth phase focused on preboarding and onboarding.

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

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

The department follows the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#), which provide important information on the following topics:

- Recruitment of tenure-track, professional practice, research faculty, and associated faculty;
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit;
- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30;
- Appointment of foreign nationals; and
- Letters of offer.

#### 4.2.1. Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The Dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints regarding salary, rank, and field of expertise, and may or may not include guidance on faculty with the potential for appointments to more than one (1) TIU.

Prior to any search, members of the search committee 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 CEF vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank if the offer involves senior rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the CEF vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The committee reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the Department Chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval from OAA.

If more than one (1) candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU, in consultation with the search committee and other members of the unit, decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU. The Department Chair is not required to extend an offer to candidates who achieve the level of support required to extend an offer. An offer can be extended to a candidate who does not achieve the required level of support from the CEF if the Department Chair deems the candidate would help the department achieve its mission and enhance its quality and reputation. The Department Chair must provide a rationale and justification to the CEF for extending an offer that goes against the CEF vote at a regular faculty and staff meeting.

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

#### 4.2.2. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically to the tenure-track faculty process, with the following exception: the candidate's presentation during the interview may be on professional or educational practice (e.g., teaching demonstration) rather than scholarship in engineering education.

#### **4.2.3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically to the tenure-track faculty process, with the following exception: the candidate is not asked to present on teaching during the interview.

#### **4.2.4. Transfer from the Tenure-Track**

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a professional practice or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the Department Chair, the College Dean, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

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. The granting of prior service credit is allowed at the time of transfer. The degree of recognized service should be collaboratively determined by the faculty member and the Department Chair.

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

#### **4.2.5. Transfer from another TIU**

Following consultation with the TIU heads and college Dean(s), a tenure-track faculty member may voluntarily request to move or transfer from one TIU to another TIU upon approval of a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. In EED, the CEF in such cases is the same as the CEF for an initial appointment at the given rank (Table 1).

If the faculty member is transferring to EED, prior to the CEF vote, the requesting faculty member must meet and informally present to the EED faculty and staff their reasoning for the transfer request. Candidates subsequently answer questions from the EED faculty and staff in preparation for a discussion held by the department to discuss the possible transfer.

All such transfers must be approved by OAA and are dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college Dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including OAA, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. The MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

The Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the

process for transferring from one TIU to another.

#### **4.2.6. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members uses a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section 4.2 above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department Chair based on recommendation from the search committee.

If an offer involves senior rank (e.g., senior lecturer), the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank to the Department Chair.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Assistant/Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies and Learning Infrastructure, the respective program director, and/or course coordinator in the candidate's area of teaching.

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

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

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

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are typically made on an annual basis with occasional hires being made for a shorter period (e.g, semester). After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

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

#### **4.2.7. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty on Regional Campuses**

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

Searches for regional campus tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty generally proceed identically to the processes outlined for Columbus campus faculty in the same role. The hiring of regional campus tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty is initiated by the Dean of the regional campus since funding for such positions comes from these campuses. The regional campus faculty have the primary responsibility for determining the position description for a regional campus faculty search. The Department

Chair should be consulted before finalizing the position description.

The regional campus search committee must include at least one (1) faculty member in the department from the Columbus campus. Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, and either the regional campus search committee or broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. All appointments are subject to approval by the College Dean and all senior rank appointments are subject to approval by OAA. Associated faculty appointed by regional campuses do not need to be associated with a TIU.

A hiring decision requires agreement by the Department Chair and regional campus Dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin. The letter of offer must be signed by the Department Chair of the proposed TIU appointment and the regional campus Dean.

#### **4.2.8. Joint Appointments**

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section 4.1.7. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

#### **4.2.9. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

Any EED faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal describing the uncompensated academic service to the department justifying the appointment should first be submitted to the GSRI and/or USLI Chair for discussion and consideration at a GSRI and/or USLI committee meeting. The given committee is determined based on the proposed activities associated with the appointment. Proposals supported by the GSRI and/or USLI committee are then shared, discussed, and considered at a regular faculty and staff meeting. A vote of the CEF is held to approve. If the proposal is approved by the CEF, the Department Chair extends an offer of appointment. The Department Chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three (3) years to determine the continuation of the appointment. Recommendations for renewal or nonrenewal are solicited before a vote of the CEF at a regular faculty and staff meeting.

### **5. Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures**

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

faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. Reviews are conducted with all compensated faculty members (tenure track, professional practice, research, and associated). 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 to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

All annual reviews must include a written assessment using the OAA Annual Review Template. Probationary faculty (tenure-track or faculty in their first contract given their faculty role) must meet face-to-face or virtually with the Department Chair. All other faculty must be given an opportunity to schedule a face-to-face or virtual meeting with the Department Chair and/or their designee. In all cases, accountability for the annual review process resides with the department chair.

In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the face-to-face or virtual meeting is to include the TIU Head or their designee for all TIUs to which the faculty member is appointed, while the written evaluation is to be prepared by the primary TIU and signed by the primary TIU Head and faculty member. The TIU Head(s) or designee(s) from a joint department may optionally sign.

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance in teaching and mentoring; research, scholarship and creative work, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload. For some faculty, annual performance and merit review will also include an evaluation of additional assignments (e.g., administration), progress toward promotion (where and when relevant), and for jointly appointed faculty, progress relative to the expectations of each TIU to which the faculty member is appointed. The review period captured in the annual review submission is the previous calendar year. Input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; any additional assignments; and goals specific to the individual. Separate goals for each TIU should be noted for those with joint appointments. The narrative should be accompanied by a numeric score determined by a department-level evaluation rubric for each evaluated category using a three (3) point meets expectations scale: 1) Does Not Meet Expectations, 2) Meets Expectations, 3) Exceeds Expectations. Meritorious performance in teaching and mentoring; research, scholarship, and creative work plans; and service should be assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The goal is to minimally meet expectations in all categories.

Additional reviews aligned with a faculty member's reappointment, promotion, and tenure are conducted by the P&T Committee at critical junctures (e.g., 4th year review for tenure-track faculty and penultimate year review for professional practice and research faculty) prior to

their reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. The P&T committee provides general feedback regarding accomplishments and progress towards promotion.

Faculty on leave for part or all of an academic year will be evaluated without prejudice for being on leave. If an individual is away for part of an academic year, then the evaluation of teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; and service will be based on activities while present.

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.

## 5.1. Approximate Timeline

The annual performance and merit review will occur during the Spring semester. The review period captured in the annual review submission is the previous calendar year. The annual review process will begin with an announcement at the last faculty and staff meeting held in January. This announcement will provide general information regarding the annual review process. A full description of the timeline, required documentation, and evaluation rubrics will be sent via email within 24 hours following the faculty and staff meeting. Reviews will be conducted using the university's faculty management software (e.g., Interfolio). Reviews will be scaffolded (Table 4) across faculty roles and contract type (9 or 12 month) to meet college deadlines and to ensure a timely response from the department following faculty submission of their materials. Mandatory and requested meetings with the Department Chair or their designee, either face-to-face or virtual, will occur in conjunction with the completion of the draft review letters. Deadlines to request non-mandatory meetings are included in Table 4. Final evaluation letters will be uploaded into the faculty management software prior to the deadline set by the college, typically around mid-May for 9M faculty and early July for 12M faculty. Non-renewals notices will be submitted to the college by the deadline set by the college, typically around the end of May.

Table 4: Timeline for faculty annual reviews.

<b>ANNUAL REVIEW TIMELINE</b>			
<b>Faculty Type</b>	<b>Deadline to Submit Annual Review Materials</b>	<b>Expected Timeframe to Receive Draft Review Letter</b>	<b>Deadline to Request Non-Mandatory Meeting</b>
Tenure-track (9M)	1 <sup>st</sup> Monday after Spring Break	End of March	1 <sup>st</sup> Monday of April
Professional Practice (9M)	4 <sup>th</sup> Friday of April	Beginning of May	2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of May
Professional Practice (12M)	4 <sup>th</sup> Friday of May	Mid-June	2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of June
Research (All)	1 <sup>st</sup> Monday after Spring Break	End of March	1 <sup>st</sup> Monday of April
Associated	1 <sup>st</sup> Friday of April	End of April	1 <sup>st</sup> Monday of May

(Compensated Except Visiting)			
Visiting (Compensated)	4 <sup>th</sup> Friday of May	Mid-June	2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of June

## 5.2. Required Documentation

The annual performance and merit review documentation is designed to align as closely as possible with the documentation required for promotion and/or tenure. Faculty members must submit the following documents within the faculty management software for the annual performance and merit review:

- Completed Annual Activities Report Template, which includes sections to report teaching and mentoring activities; scholarship, research, and creative work; service activities; administration activities (if applicable); shared values reflection, and next calendar year goals, plans, and intentions.
- Updated CV
- Updated dossier (assistant and associate rank faculty only)

Where applicable, faculty can submit information pulled directly from the OAA [dossier outline](#), (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*) built directly into the faculty management software. Information submitted should align with the requested information within the Annual Activities Report Template.

Student evaluation data for each class taught in the given calendar year will be downloaded from the university system and uploaded into the faculty management software by the unit. Supplementary information may also be offered by the faculty member, including records associated with peer review of teaching. All materials submitted will become part of the faculty member's personnel file.

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

## 5.3. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

The Department Chair will prepare a written annual review for each probationary tenure-track faculty member. The review will be drafted by the Department Chair for all faculty in their first year of their appointment within the department. Annual reviews will be conducted every year that a separate formal review (e.g., 4<sup>th</sup> year tenure and promotion review) is not conducted.

The review will be based on the documentation ([Section 5.2](#)) submitted by the faculty member. The review will use the [OAA Annual Review Template](#), which includes a description of workload allocation from the previous year for any area of effort with at least 5% assigned (e.g., teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; service; and

administration), an evaluation for each area of work in which at least 5% effort was allocated, and a summary of the evaluation. The workload allocation should reference the previous year's annual review. The evaluation should note expectations and provide a rating of the faculty member's performance using a department approved rubric. The rating will be 'does not meet expectations,' 'meets expectations,' or 'exceeds expectations.' The summary should provide an overall rating, workload allocation for the next review, explicit goals for the next calendar year, ways and means to bring about improved performance (if applicable), and a recommendation for renewal. For jointly appointed faculty, the review should also discuss the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

If the Department Chair of the TIU holding the primary appointment recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year. Faculty members may provide written comments to their annual reviews in the initial review by the Department Chair. The Department Chair may respond to the comments and/or revise the written evaluation during this process before finalizing the review. The Department Chair's review letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is uploaded into the faculty management software once signed by the Department Chair and the faculty member. A faculty member's signature can be bypassed if the faculty member does not engage in the annual review process. All faculty may be subject to disciplinary action for failing to meet faculty obligations pursuant to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.1](#). The annual review letter once finalized becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with any comments made by the faculty member).

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

### 5.3.1 Fourth Year Review

The fourth-year review will be conducted during the Spring semester of the candidate's fourth year of service and will be conducted similarly to a promotion and tenure review ([Section 6](#)). The documentation noted in [Section 6](#) is submitted around the end of May prior to the start of the 4<sup>th</sup> year. No external evaluation letters are solicited for this review. The submitted documentation is shared with the P&T Committee, who subsequently provides each faculty member with written feedback via the faculty management software.

The eligible faculty vote by written or online survey ballot to determine whether to recommend renewal of the faculty member's appointment. The Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU, in consultation with the chair(s) of any appointment TIUs (if applicable), conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a separate written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The written evaluation is uploaded to the faculty management software.

At the conclusion of the departmental 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. The major difference in procedure from the annual evaluation process is that the Dean, not the Department Chair, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

### 5.3.2 Extension of the Tenure Clock

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may extend the probationary period. [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 \(E\)](#) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period. 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.

## 5.4. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The Department Chair will prepare a written annual review for each tenured faculty member. The review will be drafted by the Department Chair for all faculty in their first year of their appointment within the department. Annual reviews will be conducted every year that a separate formal review (e.g., promotion to professor review) is not conducted.

The review will be based on the documentation submitted by the faculty member ([Section 5.2](#)). The review will use the [OAA Annual Review Template](#), which includes a description of workload allocation from the previous year for any area of effort with at least 5% assigned (e.g., teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; service; and administration), an evaluation for each area of work in which at least 5% effort was allocated, and a summary of the evaluation. The workload allocation should reference the previous year's annual review. The evaluation should note expectations and provide a rating of the faculty member's performance using a department approved rubric. The rating will be 'does not meet expectations,' 'meets expectations,' or 'exceeds expectations.' The summary should provide an overall rating, workload allocation for the next review, explicit goals for the next calendar year, ways and means to bring about improved performance (if applicable), and progress toward promotion (if applicable). For jointly appointed faculty, the review should also discuss the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

Faculty members may provide written comments to their annual reviews in the initial review by the Department Chair or designee. The Department Chair or designee may respond to the comments and/or revise the written evaluation during this process before finalizing the review. The Department Chair's review letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if

received) is uploaded into the faculty management software once signed by the Department Chair and the faculty member. A faculty member's signature can be bypassed if the faculty member does not engage in the annual review process. All faculty, including those with tenure, may be subject to disciplinary action for failing to meet faculty obligations pursuant to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.1](#). The annual review letter once finalized becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with any comments made by the faculty member).

A post-tenure review, in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.5](#), will be initiated if a tenured faculty member receives a 'does not meet performance expectation' rating in the same evaluative category in at least two of the past three consecutive annual reviews. A faculty member who retains tenure following a post-tenure review will be subject to an additional post-tenure review if they receive a 'does not meet expectations' rating in any area of their annual review in the two years after a post-tenure review. The Department Chair, Dean, or Executive Vice President and Provost may require an immediate and for cause post-tenure review at any time for a faculty member who has a documented and sustained record of significant underperformance outside of the faculty member's annual performance evaluation. For this purpose, for cause may not be based on a faculty member's allowable expression of academic freedom as defined by the university or Ohio law.

## 5.5. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The Department Chair will prepare a written annual review for each professional practice faculty member across all ranks. The review will be drafted by the Department Chair for all faculty in their first year of their appointment within the department. Annual reviews will be conducted every year that a separate formal review (e.g., penultimate year or promotion review) is not conducted.

The review will be based on the documentation ([Section 5.2](#)) submitted by the faculty member. The review will use the [OAA Annual Review Template](#), which includes a description of workload allocation from the previous year for any area of effort with at least 5% assigned (e.g., teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; service; and administration), an evaluation for each area of work in which at least 5% effort was allocated, and a summary of the evaluation. The workload allocation should reference the previous year's annual review. The evaluation should note expectations and provide a rating of the faculty member's performance using a department approved rubric. The rating will be 'does not meet expectations,' 'meets expectations,' or 'exceeds expectations.' The summary should provide an overall rating, workload allocation for the next review, explicit goals for the next calendar year, ways and means to bring about improved performance (if applicable), a recommendation for renewal (if applicable), and progress toward promotion (if applicable). For jointly appointed faculty, the review should also discuss the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

If the Department Chair of the TIU holding the primary appointment recommends renewal of a probationary appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year. Faculty members may provide written comments to their annual reviews in the initial review

by the Department Chair or designee. The Department Chair or designee may respond to the comments and/or revise the written evaluation during this process before finalizing the review. The Department Chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is uploaded into the faculty management software once signed by the Department Chair and the faculty member. A faculty member's signature can be bypassed if the faculty member does not engage in the annual review process. All faculty may be subject to disciplinary action for failing to meet faculty obligations pursuant to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.1](#). The annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion (along with any comments made by the faculty member).

### **5.5.1 Professional Practice Faculty Penultimate Year Review**

The penultimate year review for professional practice faculty will be conducted the Spring semester of the candidate's penultimate year of their probationary contract and will be conducted similarly to a tenure-track fourth year review process ([Section 5.3.1](#)). The documentation noted in [Section 6](#) is submitted around the end of May prior to the start of the penultimate year. The submitted documentation is shared with the P&T committee. The committee then provides each faculty member with written feedback. For jointly appointed faculty, the evaluation is prepared in consultation with the chair(s) of the secondary appointment TIU(s).

The P&T Committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract term is ending and will make a written recommendation to the Department Chair regarding whether the contract should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next professional practice faculty rank ([Section 6](#)). The Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU, in consultation with the chair(s) of the secondary appointment TIU(s) (if applicable), conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a separate written evaluation that includes the final decision for renewal or nonrenewal of the contract. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed. The written evaluation is uploaded to the faculty management software. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

The Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review in writing (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)). If necessary, the Department Chair will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be uploaded to the faculty management software. The primary appointment Department Chair letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college via the faculty management software. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

## **5.6. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The Department Chair will prepare a written annual review for each research faculty member across all ranks. The review will be drafted by the Department Chair for all faculty in their first

year of their appointment within the department. Annual reviews will be conducted every year that a separate formal review (e.g., penultimate year or promotion review) is not conducted.

The review will be based on the documentation ([Section 5.2](#)) submitted by the faculty member. The review will use the [OAA Annual Review Template](#), which includes a description of workload allocation from the previous year for any area of effort with at least 5% assigned (e.g., teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; service; and administration), an evaluation for each area of work in which at least 5% effort was allocated, and a summary of the evaluation. The workload allocation should reference the previous year's annual review. The evaluation should note expectations and provide a rating of the faculty member's performance using a department approved rubric. The rating will be 'does not meet expectations,' 'meets expectations,' or 'exceeds expectations.' The summary should provide an overall rating, workload allocation for the next review, explicit goals for the next calendar year, ways and means to bring about improved performance (if applicable), a recommendation for renewal (if applicable), and progress toward promotion (if applicable). For jointly appointed faculty, the review should also discuss the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

If the Department Chair of the TIU holding the primary appointment recommends renewal of a probationary appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year. Faculty members may provide written comments to their annual reviews in the initial review by the Department Chair or designee. The Department Chair or designee may respond to the comments and/or revise the written evaluation during this process before finalizing the review. The Department Chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is uploaded into the faculty management software once signed by the Department Chair and the faculty member. A faculty member's signature can be bypassed if the faculty member does not engage in the annual review process. All faculty may be subject to disciplinary action for failing to meet faculty obligations pursuant to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.1](#). The annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion (along with any comments made by the faculty member).

### **5.6.1 Research Faculty Penultimate Year Review**

The penultimate year review for research faculty will be conducted the Spring semester of the candidate's penultimate year of their probationary contract and will be conducted similarly to a promotion and tenure review ([Section 5.3.1](#)). The documentation noted in [Section 6](#) is submitted around the end of May prior to the start of the penultimate year. The submitted documentation is shared with the P&T committee. The committee then provides each faculty member with written feedback. For jointly appointed faculty, the evaluation is prepared in consultation with the chair(s) of the secondary appointment TIU(s).

The P&T Committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract term is ending and will make a written recommendation to the Department Chair regarding whether the contract should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next research faculty rank ([Section 6](#)). The Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU, in consultation with the chair(s) of

the secondary appointment TIU(s) (if applicable), conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a separate written evaluation that includes the final decision for renewal or nonrenewal of the contract. The written evaluation is uploaded to the faculty management software. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

The Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review in writing (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)). If necessary, the Department Chair will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be uploaded to the faculty management software. The primary appointment Department Chair letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college via the faculty management software. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

## 5.7. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The Department Chair or their designee (Assistant or Associate Chair) will prepare a written annual review for each compensated associated faculty member across all ranks. The review will be drafted by the Department Chair or their designee for all faculty in their first year of their appointment within the department. Annual reviews will be conducted every year that a separate formal review (e.g., promotion to Senior Lecturer) is not conducted.

The review will be based on the documentation ([Section 5.2](#)) submitted by the faculty member. The respective program director and/or course coordinator may provide support materials for annual review. The review will use the [OAA Annual Review Template](#), which includes a description of workload allocation from the previous year for any area of effort with at least 5% assigned (e.g., teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; service; and administration), an evaluation for each area of work in which at least 5% effort was allocated, and a summary of the evaluation. The workload allocation should reference the previous year's annual review. The evaluation should note expectations and provide a rating of the faculty member's performance using a department approved rubric. The rating will be 'does not meet expectations,' 'meets expectations,' or 'exceeds expectations.' The summary should provide an overall rating, workload allocation for the next review, explicit goals for the next calendar year, ways and means to bring about improved performance (if applicable), a recommendation for renewal (if applicable), and progress toward promotion (if applicable). For jointly appointed faculty, the review should also discuss the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

For multi-year contracts, the Department Chair will decide whether to reappoint no later than the end of the penultimate year of the contract.

The Department Chair's recommendation on renewal or nonrenewal of all associated faculty appointments is final.

## 5.8. Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

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.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus research faculty is conducted by the department and proceeds as described for Columbus campus research faculty. The Department Chair will provide the regional campus Dean with a copy of the faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

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

## **5.9. Salary Recommendations**

The Department Chair makes annual salary recommendations to the Dean for tenure-track, tenured, professional practice, and research faculty. The Dean may modify the recommendations. The Department Chair also makes annual salary recommendations for associated faculty that must be approved by college human resources and financial operations. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months. A salary increase can consist of one (1) or more of the following: mandatory increases as dictated across the board by the college, market salary adjustments, and merit increases.

The Department Chair consults with the Associate or Assistant Chair for Academic Administration when formulating recommendations. The Department Chair will proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in the department. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

Faculty members who wish to discuss with the Department Chair dissatisfaction with their salary increase should be prepared to a rationale and/or justification for how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

Faculty members who fail to submit the required documentation ([Section 5.2](#)) for an annual performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

## 6. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

### 6.1. Definitions

#### 6.1.1. Teaching and Mentoring

Teaching and mentoring, and evaluation of teaching and mentoring in EED for all appointment types (tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated) and ranks (including joint appointments) uses the definitions in the [APT document for COE](#).

#### 6.1.2. Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work, and evaluation of scholarship, research and creative work in EED for all appointment types (tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated) and ranks (including joint appointments) uses the definitions in the [APT document for COE](#).

#### 6.1.3. Service

Service and evaluation of service in EED for all tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty at all ranks (including jointly appointed faculty) uses the definitions in the [APT document for COE](#).

### 6.2. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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

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

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

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

Generally speaking, an appointment to an assistant position involves *potential*. A promotion to an associate position involves *achievement* of an overall record that meets expectations combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. A promotion to a full position involves *achievement* of a sustained record of achievement and scholarly independence.

### 6.2.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

The criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure (Tables 5-7) involve strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth, productivity, sustained accomplishment, and scholarly independence in the areas of teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; and service.

Table 5: Teaching criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrates growth in effective teaching of assigned undergraduate and/or graduate courses	SEI or SSLE reports, and/or other teaching evaluations
Engages in advising and mentoring engineering education graduate students	Involvement in candidacy exams and dissertations
Engages in Peer Review of Teaching activities (PRT)	PRT reporting form

Table 6: Scholarship, research, and creative work criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Disseminates work through publications, public forums, and other creative work	Publications in journals, conference proceedings, books, or other venues; invited presentations, keynotes, guest lecturers, or panels
Secures external funding	Record of external grants received

Table 7: Service criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Participates in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees	Documented participation in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees
Engages in service to the college, university, and/or external professional societies/organizations	Documented participation in service external to the department

Excellence in all areas must demonstrate professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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 TIU's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university. Tenure will be reserved for faculty members who: (a) have made substantive achievements in scholarship and clearly demonstrated potential to become distinguished scholars and recognized leaders in engineering education, (b) are effective teachers in the classroom and advisors / mentors outside the classroom, (c) provide high quality service inside and outside of the university, and (d) demonstrate a strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment, including, but not limited to scholarly independence and leadership roles.

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

### 6.2.2. Promotion to Professor

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

The criteria for promotion to professor (Tables 8-10) involve strong and sustained evidence of achievement in the areas of teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; and service, combined with the attainment of scholarly independence and recognition as a leader in the field of engineering education that leads to national or international distinction.

Table 8: Teaching criteria for promotion to Professor.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrates effective teaching of assigned undergraduate and/or graduate courses	SEI or SSLE reports, and/or other teaching evaluations

Engages in advising and mentoring engineering education graduate students	Involvement in candidacy exams and dissertations
Engages in Peer Review of Teaching activities (PRT)	PRT reporting form

Table 9: Scholarship, research, and creative work criteria for promotion to Professor.

<b>SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Disseminates work through publications, public forums, and other creative work	Publications in journals, conference proceedings, books, or other venues; invited presentations, keynotes, guest lecturers, or panels
Secures external funding	Record of external grants received

Table 10: Service criteria for promotion to Professor.

<b>SERVICE</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Participates in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees	Documented participation in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees
Engages in service to the college, university, and/or external professional societies/organizations	Documented participation in service external to the department

Promotion to professor requires ongoing professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

As specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one (1) area against lighter responsibilities in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that: (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments, (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions, and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact through their teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university.

### 6.2.3. Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty

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

### Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor

The criteria for promotion to professional practice associate professor (Tables 11-13) involve strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth, productivity, sustained accomplishment, and scholarly independence in the areas of teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; and service, particularly teaching and mentoring. Professional practice faculty can align themselves with either the teaching or practice pathway. They may also choose to engage in a combination of activities across both pathways.

Table 11: Teaching criteria for promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor.

<b>TEACHING</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Demonstrates growth in effective teaching of assigned undergraduate and/or graduate courses	SEI or SSLE, reports, and/or other teaching evaluations
Engages in PRT	PRT reporting form

Table 12: Scholarship, research, and creative work criteria for promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor.

<b>SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Disseminates work through publications, public forums, and other creative work	Publications in journals, conference proceedings, books, or other venues; invited presentations, keynotes, guest lecturers, or panels
Engages in ongoing scholarly activity	Record of collaboration or curriculum development

Table 13: Service criteria for promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor.

<b>SERVICE</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Participates in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees	Documented participation in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees

Excellence in all areas must demonstrate professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

### Promotion to Professional Practice Professor

The criteria for promotion to professional practice professor (Tables 14-16) involve strong and sustained evidence of achievement in the areas of teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; and service, combined with the attainment of scholarly independence and recognition as a leader in the field of engineering education that leads to national or international distinction in teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; or service, particularly teaching and mentoring and administrative service.

Table 14: Teaching criteria for promotion to Professional Practice Professor.

<b>TEACHING</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Demonstrates effective teaching of assigned undergraduate and/or graduate courses	SEI or SSLE, reports, and/or other teaching evaluations
Engages in PRT	PRT reporting form

Table 15: Scholarship, research, and creative work criteria for promotion to Professional Practice Professor.

<b>SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Disseminates work through publications, public forums, and other creative work	Publications in journals, conference proceedings, books, or other venues; invited presentations, keynotes, guest lecturers, or panels
Engages in ongoing scholarly activity	Record of collaboration or curriculum development

Table 16: Service criteria for promotion to Professional Practice Professor.

<b>SERVICE</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Participates in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees	Documented participation in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor requires ongoing professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

#### 6.2.4. Promotion of Research Faculty

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

### Promotion to Research Associate Professor

The criteria for promotion to research associate professor (Tables 17 & 18) involve strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth, productivity, sustained accomplishment, and scholarly independence in the areas of scholarship, research, and creative work; and service, particularly scholarship, research, and creative work.

Table 17: Scholarship, research, and creative work criteria for promotion to Research Associate Professor.

SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Disseminates work through publications, public forums, and other creative work	Publications in journals, conference proceedings, books, or other venues; invited presentations, keynotes, guest lecturers, or panels
Secures external funding	Record of external grants received
Engages in advising and mentoring engineering education graduate students	Involvement in candidacy exams and dissertations

Table 18: Service criteria for promotion to Research Associate Professor.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Participates in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees	Documented participation in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees
Engages in service to the college, university, and/or external professional societies/organizations	Documented participation in service external to the department

Excellence in all areas must demonstrate professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

### Promotion to Research Professor

The criteria for promotion to research professor (Tables 19 & 20) involve strong and sustained evidence of achievement in the areas of teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; and service, combined with the attainment of scholarly independence and recognition as a leader in the field of engineering education that leads to national or international distinction specifically in scholarship, research, and creative work.

Table 19: Scholarship, research, and creative work criteria for promotion to Research Professor.

<b>SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Disseminates work through publications, public forums, and other creative work	Publications in journals, conference proceedings, books, or other venues; invited presentations, keynotes, guest lecturers, or panels
Secures external funding	Record of external grants received
Engages in advising and mentoring engineering education graduate students	Involvement in candidacy exams and dissertations

Table 20: Service criteria for promotion to Research Professor.

<b>SERVICE</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Participates in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees	Documented participation in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees
Engages in service to the college, university, and/or external professional societies/organizations	Documented participation in service external to the department

Promotion to Research Professor requires ongoing professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

### 6.2.5. Associated Faculty

#### **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 ([Section 6.2](#)).

#### **Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

The criteria for promotion to senior lecturer (Tables 21-23) involve achievement combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement.

The criteria for promotion to senior lecturer involves strong and sustained evidence of potential for continued growth, productivity, and sustained achievement primarily in the area of teaching and mentoring.

Table 21: Teaching criteria for promotion of Senior Lecturers.

<b>TEACHING</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Demonstrates growth in effective teaching of assigned undergraduate and/or graduate courses	SEI or SSLE reports, and/or other teaching evaluations
Engages in PRT	PRT reporting form

Table 22: Service criteria for promotion of Senior Lecturers.

<b>SERVICE</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Participates in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees	Documented participation in departmental responsibilities and assigned committees

Table 23: Scholarship, research, and creative work criteria for promotion Senior Lecturers (if applicable).

<b>SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Disseminates work through publications, public forums, and other creative work	Publications in journals, conference proceedings, books, or other venues; invited presentations, keynotes, guest lecturers, or panels
Engages in ongoing scholarly activity	Record of collaboration or curriculum development

Excellence in all areas must demonstrate professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

### 6.2.6. Regional Campus Faculty

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

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. This consideration should be considered when evaluating regional campus tenure-track faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion. The department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. It should also be recognized that the character and quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due

to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources. The department nevertheless expects regional campus tenure-track faculty to establish programs of impactful scholarly activity.

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

### 6.3. Procedures & Approximate Timeline

Background: Faculty Rules [3335-6-04](#) for tenure-track faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for professional practice faculty, and [3335-7-32](#) for research faculty.

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in the Faculty Rules and the OAA annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

The schedule for promotion and tenure reviews, including sixth-year probationary faculty reviews, early promotion reviews, and other promotion reviews is set by COE. The following schedule provides an approximate timeline for tasks.

Table 24: Timeline for promotion and tenure reviews.

PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEW APPROXIMATE TIMELINE	
Date / Timeframe	Task
April 1	EED confirms faculty member intention for promotion and/or tenure for upcoming cycle; non-probationary review candidates submit an updated CV for internal P&T review. [Note: A tenured (Faculty Rule <a href="#">3335-6-04</a> ), professional practice (Faculty Rules <a href="#">3335-7-08</a> ), or research (Faculty Rule <a href="#">3335-7-36</a> ) faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review for one (1) year.]
April - May	EED provides name(s) of candidate(s) to COE. COE creates case(s) in the faculty management software system (e.g., Interfolio) and notifies candidates, so that candidates can upload materials.
May – June	Candidate submits dossier for internal compliance review. Candidate(s) is provided feedback and given an opportunity to update and finalize the dossier.
End of June	External review letters are requested.
August 14	Final dossier submitted and certified.
Mid-August – Mid-September	Case is reviewed and voted on by CEF. Summary report sent to Department Chair.
Mid-September – Late September	Department Chair reviews case and submits a written review.
End of September	Candidate receives EED reviews and has 10 calendar days to respond via a written comment (or no comment).
Mid-October	Case is sent to COE for review.
Beginning of December	COE reviews completed and sent to the Dean.
End of January	Dean reviews case and submits a written review.
End of January	Candidate receives COE reviews and has 10 calendar days to respond via

	a written comment (or no comment)
Mid-February	COE submits case to OAA for review
February – March	OAA reviews cases.
April	OAA sends letter to college, candidate, and Department Chair notifying of P&T recommendations
May	Board of Trustees votes on P&T cases

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

#### 6.3.1.1 Candidate Responsibilities

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

##### 6.3.1.1.1 Dossier

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with the OAA [dossier guideline](#) incorporated within the faculty management software. Candidates should not sign the OAA [Candidate Checklist](#) without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements for a given role and rank set forth in the OAA core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist. Supplementary documentation may be offered by the candidate or may be requested by the P&T Committee Chair or the Department Chair.

In teaching and mentoring; scholarship, research, and creative work; and service, and in a few specific subcategories of each (described in upcoming sections), ratings of the candidate's record will be provided on a three (3) point scale: does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations. A record that 'meets expectations' is a minimal expectation for promotion in that category. The P&T Committee rarely will rate the record of a promotion candidate as 'does not meet expectations,' but these ratings may be seen more frequently in annual or fourth-year reviews in situations where substantial improvement is required to meet expectations.

While the P&T 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 of their current position to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five (5) years, whichever is less, to present. The eligible faculty should consider all OAA approved prior service time and recognized prior service noted at initial appointment for those transferring from tenure-track or reclassifying from associated faculty. The committee may also allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start or hire date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion or reappointment may be provided. Any such material not OAA approved as prior service time should be clearly indicated. It is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties regardless of additional information provided.

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 (5) years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty should consider all OAA approved prior service time and may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

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

Documentation for promotion and tenure or promotion is described in the following sections.

### **Teaching and Mentoring**

The teaching and mentoring component of the review will include summary evaluations of the following areas when applicable: classroom teaching, curriculum development, professional development, and advising or supervision of students. Expected documentation for these components when applicable is described in the following sections.

#### **1. Classroom Teaching**

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the classroom teaching sub-category of teaching and mentoring will include:

- Summary of formal, institutionally implemented Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEI) or Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE)
  - Score reports provided by the department
  - Summary of comments drafted by the department and reviewed / approved by the faculty member before inclusion in the dossier
- Peer observations of instruction
  - Probationary tenure-track and professional practice faculty will have their teaching reviewed by a peer at least once per year during the first two (2) years of service and at least twice more before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review

- Tenured, associate professors and non-probationary professional practice associate professors will have their teaching reviewed at least once every other year, with the goal of having at least two (2) peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review
- Lecturers planning to seek promotion to Senior Lecturer will have their teaching reviewed at least once per year in each of the two (2) years leading up to the promotion review.

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the classroom teaching sub-category of teaching and mentoring may include when applicable:

- Formative feedback on teaching (e.g., student evaluation of teaching questionnaires; encouraged for small enrollment courses that do not produce institutionally implemented student evaluations)
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from former students and other faculty regarding teaching effectiveness
- Awards for teaching

The department will follow the procedures for peer review of teaching as set forth in the unit's PRT program.

## **2. Curriculum Development**

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the curriculum development sub-category of teaching and mentoring may include when applicable:

- Curriculum and content development and innovations (e.g., syllabi, teaching materials, and instructional aids)
- Textbook and course material development
- Pedagogical innovations
- Publications about teaching and learning
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding curricular contributions
- Awards for curriculum development

## **3. Professional Development**

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the professional development sub-category of teaching and mentoring will include:

- Record of completed PRT activities

## **4. Student Advising and Supervision**

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the student advising and supervision sub-

category of teaching and mentoring may include when applicable:

- Sustained progress toward degree completion by Ph.D. and M.S. thesis students advised
- Service on Ph.D. dissertation and M.S. thesis committees of students who have other primary advisors
- Service as a faculty mentor for student organizations or student-led initiatives
- Service on undergraduate senior thesis committees
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding advising contributions
- Mentorship awards
- Awards received by students advised

Each faculty member is expected to perform academic advising and/or supervision as appropriate to their rank and track. Faculty with student advising and supervision expectations are assigned by the department to graduate students, provide appropriate advice regarding course and program matters, and support career and graduate school choices. The primary distinguishing factor in this sub-category of teaching and mentoring will be the role of the candidate in advising graduate student scholarship leading to Ph.D. and M.S. (thesis) degrees, and, when applicable, research by undergraduates, including senior theses.

### **Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work**

Scholarship, research, and creative work is a required activity for tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty; optional for associated faculty. Such endeavors in EED involve primarily scholarship that advances engineering education. Scholarship for professional practice faculty and associated faculty opting to engage in scholarship typically involves scholarship of teaching and learning, which often includes course development and evaluation, curriculum development and evaluation, assessment of student learning outcomes, and instructional approaches. The scholarship component of the review will include summary evaluations of quality, quantity, significance/impact, and funding. Expected documentation for these components is described in the following sections.

#### **1. Quality**

Quality refers to the degree to which the candidate's scholarship, research, or creative work represents intellectual achievement, namely originality, novelty, and intrinsic value of scholarly contributions.

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the quality of scholarship will often include:

- Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (when available);
- Prestige (reputation and visibility), selectivity, impact factors, and relevance to the scholarship of publication outlets;

- Patents, patent applications, and similar evidence of technological innovation;
- Competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically important co-PI or Senior Personnel;
- Invited presentations at other institutions;
- Invitations to serve on editorial boards of journals;
- Invitations to serve on editorial boards or program committees of journals or conferences;
- Invitations to serve on government or professional organization policy-making panels and boards; and
- Special commendations and honors for the quality of scholarship (e.g., professional society Fellow designation).

The wide range of scholarly pursuits within engineering education can result in research papers appearing in journals and proceedings across numerous related disciplines. In many areas of the discipline (e.g., computer science education), conference publications are rigorously reviewed and considered prestigious, allowing such publications to be viewed as equivalent to premier journal publications.

## 2. Quantity

Quantity refers to the total body of scholarly results the candidate has produced and effectively disseminated to the broader community, typically through, but not limited to, publication. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the quantity of scholarship will include:

- Number of equivalent papers, i.e., accounting for multiple authorship and paper length, appearing in or fully accepted by publication outlets that can be attributed to the candidate's research publication efforts;
- Number of publications appearing in lower-tier outlets; and
- Number of substantial creative works or work products other than traditional publications (e.g., novels or software) (if applicable).

The number of other publications will be considered evidence of quantity but generally will have less weight than publications in top-tier publication outlets. Similarly, work products that have been considered in hiring the candidate generally will be of less importance in quantity-of-scholarship determination than those produced during the current contract. For faculty members hired as Associate Professor or with OAA approved years credited toward tenure, the totality of the record will be considered when assessing quantity, along with the expectation for productivity while at Ohio State.

Ohio State specifically asks the candidate to include a description of both the intellectual contribution (qualitative) and effort contribution (quantitative) within the dossier for each substantial publication. The P&T Committee may contact non-student co-authors to confirm such descriptions.

In some situations, non-traditional scholarly products and methods of dissemination will need to be evaluated. The candidate should provide appropriate documentation to permit adequate evaluation.

### 3. Significance / Impact

Significance / impact refers to the degree to which the candidate's work is fundamentally important for the field, as well as the extent to which it has been recognized, cited, adopted, and/or built upon by others. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the significance / impact of scholarship may include when applicable:

- Independent external evaluators' opinions of the significance / impact of the work (when available);
- P&T Committee members' assessments of the significance / impact of the work;
- Citations of the candidate's work by others; and
- Adoption and use of the candidate's scholarly results and techniques, or other work products, by others.

### 4. Funding

Competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts to support scholarship will be considered in evaluating the candidate's scholarly program. Tenure-track and research faculty have an expectation to obtain funding, specifically to support graduate students to do research and to contribute to the financial stability of the department. Professional practice and associated faculty opting to engage in research are encouraged but not expected to obtain such funding. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess funding of scholarship may include when applicable:

- Grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically important co-PI or Senior Personnel;
- Number of graduate students supported with external funding;
- Total amount of external funding for the candidate's research program; and
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from collaborators, especially a project PI, documenting the importance of the candidate's role in obtaining the funding and accomplishing the work for funded projects where the candidate is a co-PI or Senior Personnel.

The primary distinguishing factor in this sub-category of scholarship, research, and creative work will be procurement of external funding that supports students, and for which the EED and/or an EED-related center receives appropriate expenditure credit. All external awards will be considered equally important in rating the funding sub-category of scholarship, research, and creative work. Internal awards will also be factored in to a lesser extent for tenure-track and research faculty. Non-competitive proposals should also be noted to demonstrate overall efforts to obtain funding.

### Service and Engagement

The service component of the review will include summary evaluations of internal service and external service (if applicable). Expected documentation for these components is described

in separate sections.

### **1. Internal Service**

Every faculty member is expected to contribute to the effective governance of the department. Senior faculty are expected to contribute to the effective governance of the college and university as well. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the internal (department, college, and university) sub-category of service may include when applicable:

- Effective involvement and active participation in assigned department, college, and/or university committees; and
- Observations made by P&T Committee members who have served with the candidate on committees and/or have been served by the candidate's activities.

### **2. External Service**

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the external (professional and community) sub- category of service may include when applicable:

- Professional activities, such as conference organization, professional organization leadership, program committees, editorships, manuscript reviewing, reviewing of proposals for funding agencies, etc.;
- Public service related to the candidate's professional expertise;
- Outreach activities; and
- Consulting activities.

External service is not required for associated faculty.

#### **6.3.1.1.2 Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Document**

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed using the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either: (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of professional practice and research faculty), whichever of these two (2) latter documents is the more recent. 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 on the [Office of Academic Affairs website](#), 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.

#### **6.3.1.1.3 External Evaluations for Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty**

Promotions for tenured, tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty require external evaluations ([Section 6.3.3](#)). Candidates should submit a list of up to four (4) potential external evaluators to the Chair of the P&T Committee and the Department Chair. The P&T

Committee and Department Chair will consider the list submitted by the candidate. The list of the external evaluators who submit letters may not contain more than two (2) names recommended by the candidate.

### **6.3.1.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the P&T Committee are as follows:

- Review this APT document annually and recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- Determine if all required documentation for a full review (e.g., student and peer evaluations of teaching) is available. Lack of the required documentation is sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review. The committee would then base its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the package that includes documents submitted by the faculty member, as well as external letters and on information provided by all TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed, taking into consideration any MOU concerning a jointly hired candidate's expectations for performance.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for non-probationary professional practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
  - A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, Department Chair, or any other party into making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process.
- Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The POD's responsibilities are described in the [Role and Responsibilities of the POD guidelines](#).

- Solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the P&T Committee, Department Chair, and the candidate. This is the responsibility of the committee chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs ([Section 6.3.3](#)). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists. ([Section 6.3.3](#))
- Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with OAA requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service based on information provided by all TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed, taking into consideration any MOU concerning a jointly hired candidate's expectations for performance to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the CEF faculty to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose TIU is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other TIU substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

#### **6.3.1.3. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities**

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

- Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- Attend all eligible faculty meetings, except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance, and participate in discussion of every case before voting.

#### **6.3.1.4. Department Chair Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Charge each member of the P&T Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- 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. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the Department Chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- Review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in the department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- Make each candidate's dossier available on the faculty management software for review by the P&T Committee at least two (2) weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- Remove any member of the P&T Committee from the review of a candidate when the member has a COI but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- 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.
- Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- Meet with the CEF to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- Inform each candidate in writing, after completion of the department review process:
  - recommendations by the P&T Committee and Department Chair;
  - availability for review of the written evaluations by the P&T Committee and Department Chair; and
  - opportunity to submit written comments on the recommendations and evaluations, 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 they will submit comments.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- Forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline,
- Receive the P&T Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along

with the Department Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other TIU by the date requested.

### **6.3.2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section 6 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 chair is final in such cases).

#### **6.3.2.1 Internal Letters of Support for Associated Faculty**

Promotions for associated faculty to Senior Lecturer require internal letters of support. Candidates should submit two (2) letters of support that speak to the candidate's teaching abilities and experience, departmental leadership and/or service, and professional development activities as appropriate. If one of these two (2) letters is not from a director or course coordinator of the programmatic area in which the Lecturer teaches, the candidate should also include a one-paragraph statement, signed by the respective director or course coordinator, confirming support of the Lecturer's application.

Candidates must also receive a letter written by the Lecturer's supervisor that synthesizes the candidate's annual reviews. The letter should provide a longitudinal evaluation and recommendation for the candidate that addresses the candidate's teaching and service in the EED.

### **6.3.3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty**

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

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

Regional campus professional practice faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean. Following the review, the regional campus 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.

### **6.3.4. External Evaluations**

For tenure-track, professional practice, and research candidates under consideration for promotion, the department will seek external evaluations predominately, but not exclusively,

from evaluators in the following peer and aspirational programs – Purdue University, Virginia Tech, University of Michigan, Arizona State University, University at Buffalo, Penn State, University of Colorado at Boulder, University of Florida, University of Pittsburgh, and University of Washington – as well as the following aspirational peer programs – University of California – Berkeley, Stanford University, Cornell University, Tufts University, and University of California – San Diego. These institutions represent AAU, Big 10, and Engineering Education peers. Evaluations need not be restricted to national or international peers but should derive from authoritative and reputable sources qualified to comment substantively on the contributions and accomplishments of the faculty member. This includes a minority of evaluations coming from industry or professional practice faculty at Ohio State who are not officially affiliated with EED.

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

The P&T Committee and the Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU will assemble the list of evaluators. In cases of jointly appointed faculty, additional evaluators may be suggested by the Department Chair of the secondary appointment TIU as appropriate. Each candidate will be asked to submit a list of collaborators and a separate list of no more than four (4) potential external evaluators, none of which should be collaborators. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, at least one (1), at most two (2), will be sought. The P&T Committee and the Department Chair will generate additional names for external evaluators avoiding the collaborators named by the candidate. 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. If the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither OAA nor the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

A minimum of five (5) credible and useful evaluations must be obtained for tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty. Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are ideally 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 (5) useful letters result from the first round of requests.

A COI 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 (exception, one (1) letter from an internal reviewer not associated with the candidate's TIUs may be submitted for professional practice faculty promotion cases), 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.

Qualifications of the external evaluator are generally judged based on the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. For tenured and research faculty candidates, the department will only solicit evaluations from professors. In the case of a tenure-track assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

For professional practice faculty candidates, the department will solicit evaluations from tenured professors, professional practice professors, teaching professors, or other equivalent titles. In the case of a professional practice assistant professor seeking promotion to professional practice associate professor, a minority of evaluations may come from associate professors. One (1) letter can be written by an internal reviewer not associated with the candidate's TIUs for any professional practice faculty promotion.

The letter should provide 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. The department follows the OAA 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](#).

A credible and useful evaluation is written by a person highly qualified to evaluate one (1) or more of the elements in a candidate's record. The candidate's record includes multiple elements and priority of these elements depends on the desired rank or tenure status of the candidate. These elements include:

- Scholarly contributions, including contributions to the Scholarship of Discovery or the Scholarship or Integration (typically for tenure-track or research faculty) or contributions to the Scholarship of Application (e.g., improving courses and curricula to apply the best of industry and/or educational practices) or Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (typically for practice faculty),
- Teaching and mentoring
- Service,
- Administration, and
- If applicable, relationships the candidate maintains with industry or education professionals to stay current with their associated practice.

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 (e.g., requesting permission from OAA 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, during the review process.

If the P&T Chair is unable to obtain the required five (5) external evaluations, the P&T Chair must document all efforts, noting the individuals who were contacted, how they were contacted, and the dates and number of times they were contacted. The department is to notify the college and OAA as soon as it becomes apparent that it will not be able to obtain the required letters in time for the meeting of the CEF. The lack of five (5) external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, P&T chair, and the Department Chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and agree that it will not constitute a procedural error.

All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier unless the total received letters violates the number of letters written by candidate recommendations or letters are received by external evaluators who do not meet the necessary requirements. 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 OAA for advice.

## 7. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

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

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

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.

The [Rules of the University Faculty](#) regarding appeals will apply. 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 (1) or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

## 8. Seventh Year Review

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

## 9. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

### 9.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

## 9.2 Peer Review of Teaching

The Assistant/Associate Chair for Academic Administration oversees the department's Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) process. Faculty are required to complete two (2) PRT activities each year from one or more of the following categories, based on the requirements of their position: (a) providing feedback, (b) teaching training and development, and (c) pedagogical materials and scholarship of teaching and learning. Details for each category can be found on the in the EED Microsoft Team. New faculty starting during the Autumn semester are exempt from completing PRT activities for that year since annual evaluations occur based on the calendar year.

Evidence of PRT activity completion is submitted through the [Peer Review of Teaching Reporting Form](#) and included in the faculty annual evaluation documentation submitted to the Department Chair.

The following stipulations apply for faculty based on their rank, role, and contract status:

- probationary tenure-track faculty and probationary professional practice and associated faculty on their first contract are required to have an EED peer faculty member review of their teaching at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- tenured associate professors, non-probationary professional practice assistant professors, non-probationary professional practice associate professors, and associated faculty on their second contract are required to have an EED peer faculty member review of their teaching at least once every other year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned; tenured associate professors, non-probationary professional practice assistant professors, and non-probationary professional practice associate professors should aim to minimally have at least four (4) peer reviews of teaching over a six (6) year period before the commencement of a promotion review.
- tenured professors, non-probationary professional practice professors, and associated faculty on their third or greater contract are required to have an EED peer faculty member review of their teaching at least once every three (3) years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instructional materials except when the course(s) being taught are overseen by a course coordinator. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and, if applicable, reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as teaching effectiveness, appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer should meet with the candidate to give feedback. A written report should be given to the candidate within two (2) weeks of the final observation. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if desired. The final report should be submitted through the [Peer Review of Teaching Reporting Form](#). The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

The annual review process can include a request for a faculty member to engage in an EED peer faculty member review of their teaching 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 request focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested in the annual review and may not include class visitations.

Any faculty member may request an EED peer faculty member review of their teaching at any time regardless of the noted stipulations. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. Faculty seeking formative reviews should consider all options embedded in the PRT process as well as other services offered by the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

## Appendix: Associated Faculty Reclassifications to Professional Practice Faculty

Associated faculty can be reclassified to a professional practice appointment if appropriate circumstances exist and the opportunity is approved by the Dean. Reclassification opportunities approved by the Dean will be made open to all associated faculty regardless of current rank or role to ensure fairness. Candidates will be expected to meet the same criteria noted for professional practice faculty ([Section 4.1.2](#)). Associated faculty should note that a reclassification is not equivalent to a promotion. Reclassification is used when transitioning a faculty member into a new role within the department. The granting of prior service credit is allowed at the time of initial appointment. The degree of recognized service should be collaboratively determined by the faculty member and the Department Chair.

The reclassification process is not subject to OAA approved processes but will align closely to ensure consistency in the hiring processes of faculty within the department. The modified approach involves four (4) phases:

- Phase 1 | Reclassification Preparation involves the formation of a review committee, creating a reclassification strategy (including timeline), and developing an application template for candidates.
- Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants focuses on application review and candidate screening. The guidelines and resources provided by OAA should be referenced to support consistency, fairness, and equity in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process.
- Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations engages candidates in an on-campus visit, involving a presentation focused on teaching/practice and vision for the role, and collection of feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. The required procedures outlined for a professional practice faculty initial appointment ([Section 3.3.2](#)) should be followed, including a vote of the CEF. This phase concludes with the submission of a debrief report from the review committee to the Department Chair.
- Phase 4 | Extend Offer is completed by the Department Chair. Deferred offers may be extended if forthcoming reclassifications have been approved by the Dean.