Department of Integrated Systems Engineering

The Ohio State University

Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

November 24, 2025

Revision OAA Approved: November 26, 2025

Table of Contents

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty; the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook; and other policies and procedures of the College of Engineering (the "College") and University to which the Department of Integrated Systems Engineering (the "Department") and its faculty are subject.

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

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

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles that are articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted 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 University's policy on equal employment opportunity.

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Department of Integrated Systems Engineering (ISE) at The Ohio State University is to prepare students to serve society, with emphasis on design, planning, operations and management of complex systems, providing students with a blend of technical, managerial and human-centered skills, and to advance the state-of-the-art of industrial engineering through world-class research. We pursue these goals by:

Providing undergraduate and graduate industrial and systems engineering education that prepares students to apply effectively engineering principles and tools to evaluate, design, and operate complex industrial, service, and governmental systems comprised of people, equipment, and supplies through the application of modeling, economic principles, and optimization tools.

- Contributing to the enrichment of the profession and to the creation of knowledge through faculty leadership, world-class research, scholarship, and professional practice.

- Meeting the demands of industry by preparing students in the fields of operations research, advanced statistical data analysis, analytics, ergonomics and human factors, manufacturing processes, and others.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

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

The Department Chair, the Dean and Assistant and Associate Deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

1. Tenure-track Faculty Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the tenure reviews of associate professors without tenure, the eligible faculty consists of all professors.
- For the promotion reviews of associate professors to the rank of professor, the eligible faculty consists of all professors.

2. Professional Practice Faculty Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal

- **Appointment Review.** For the initial appointment of an associated faculty member, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track and professional practice faculty in the department.

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

- **Reappointments and Contract Renewals**. For reappointments and contract renewals, the eligible faculty are all nonprobationary professional practice faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

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

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

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

  The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

5. Conflict of Interest

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

6. Minimum Composition

In the event that the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the Dean of the College, will appoint a faculty member from another Department within the college.

B. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

All faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions are reviewed by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Thus, the Department does not have a separate Promotion and Tenure Committee.

C. QUORUM

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not

considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum and cannot vote.

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

D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Faculty who did not attend the entire discussion of a case are not permitted to vote on that case.

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

1. Recommendation for Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when at least 60% of the votes that are cast are positive.

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

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

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when at least 60% of the votes cast are positive.

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

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. CRITERIA

The Department is committed to making faculty appointments (including joint appointments) that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the Department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, graduate student advising, scholarship, and service; the potential for professional growth in

each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the Department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the Department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

To be appointed to the tenure-track faculty, a candidate must have:

- demonstrated through clear and convincing evidence that criteria for the particular appointment have been met or exceeded in the following areas: teaching, scholarship, and service; and
- strong potential to enhance the quality and reputation of the department.

Instructor. An appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the doctorate have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. Instructor appointments are limited to three years, in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor to be reduced from their probationary period. This request must be approved by the Department's Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should consider carefully whether prior service credit is appropriate, because prior-
service credit cannot be revoked once it is granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. To be appointed as a tenure-track assistant professor, the candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria:

- The candidate must possess an earned doctorate in a field of study that is relevant to industrial and/or systems engineering or possess extensive relevant experience.
- The candidate's reference letters must strongly suggest that the candidate has the potential to be an outstanding teacher, mentor, and scholar.
- The candidate must demonstrate excellence in verbal and written communication.
- The candidate must demonstrate the potential for excellence in scholarship, including the ability to formulate and complete a major body of work and clearly communicate the results and their significance.
- The candidate's stated career goals must be consistent with the Department's

mission.

- The candidate's performance during the interview and the candidate's references should indicate a potential to perform effective service within the Department.

Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of the Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

Associate Professor with Tenure. The following two minimum criteria apply to be appointed as an associate professor with tenure.

- The candidate must clearly exceed all the criteria that are established by the Department for appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor.
- The candidate must clearly meet all the Department's criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

It is extremely important that candidates for such appointments have demonstrated ability as teachers, mentors, and scholars. Evidence of scholarly ability is obtained from a careful and thorough review of the candidate's record and from the evaluations of references. Teaching ability may be demonstrated through previous experience as a faculty member with documented evidence of excellent teaching and mentoring performance.

Professor with Tenure. The following two minimum criteria apply to be appointed as a professor with tenure.

- The candidate must clearly exceed all criteria that are established by the Department for appointment as an associate professor with tenure.
- The candidate must clearly meet all the Department's criteria for promotion to professor with tenure.

Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure. An appointment as associate professor or professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of Office of Academic Affairs.

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

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs. An MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not
U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2. Professional Practice Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other professional practice faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for Professional Practice assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years.

There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. Reappointment is based on the faculty member's performance and the continued needs of the Department.

In accordance with the College of Engineering Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document, a member of the Professional Practice faculty will be referred to as a "Professional Practice Instructor" or a "Professional Practice Professor" with qualifiers "Assistant" or "Associate," as appropriate.

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

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. To be appointed as a professional practice assistant professor, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum requirements.

- The candidate should have a record of accomplishments clearly demonstrating their capability in the practice of the discipline.
- The candidate's reference letters must strongly suggest that the candidate has the potential for to be an outstanding teacher and mentor.
- The candidate must demonstrate excellence in verbal and written communication.

- The candidate's performance during the interview and the candidate's references should indicate a potential to perform effective service to the Department.

The candidate shall have at least a Master's degree and preferably a doctorate in a field that is relevant to industrial and/or systems engineering. Professional publications and actual teaching experience are helpful, but not required.

Professional Practice Associate Professor. To be appointed as a professional practice associate professor, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria.

- The candidate must clearly exceed all the criteria that are established by the Department for appointment as professional practice assistant professor.
- The candidate must clearly meet or exceed all the Department's criteria for promotion to professional practice associate professor.

Professional Practice Professor. To be appointed as professional practice professor, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria.

- The candidate must clearly exceed all criteria that are established by the Department for appointment as professional practice associate professor.
- The candidate must clearly meet or exceed the Department's criteria for promotion to professional practice professor.

3. Research Faculty

Appointments of research faculty entail one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. Research faculty members may participate with voting rights in matters of governance and committee service at the college level, except that they cannot participate or vote on promotion and tenure matters of tenure track faculty or faculty of practice (Faculty Rule 3335-7-37).

Research Assistant Professor. To be appointed as a research assistant professor, the candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria.

- The candidate must possess an earned doctorate in a field of study that is relevant to industrial and/or systems engineering or possess extensive relevant experience.
- The candidate must have a record of high-quality publications.
- The candidate's record must strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.
- The candidate's performance during the interview and the candidate's references should indicate a potential to perform effective service to the Department.

Research Associate Professor. To be appointed as a research associate professor, the candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria.

- The candidate must clearly exceed all the criteria that are established by the

Department for appointment as research assistant professor.
- The candidate must clearly meet or exceed all the Department's criteria for promotion to research associate professor.

Research Professor. To be appointed as research Professor, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria.
- The candidate must clearly exceed all the criteria that are established by the Department appointment as a research associate professor.
- The candidate must clearly meet or exceed the Department's criteria for promotion to research professor.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty are persons with adjunct titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles. Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than fifty per cent service to the university are also associated faculty members. Persons with tenure track, professional practice, or research faculty titles may not hold associated titles. Persons holding associated titles are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in Department governance or review of faculty appointments, reappointments, or tenure. Consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-5-19, associated faculty appointments can be made for a maximum of three consecutive years and may be renewed.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be either compensated or not compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give considerable academic service to the Department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Lecturer. Appointment as a Lecturer requires that an individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field that is appropriate to the subject matter that is to be taught or substantial relevant work experience, along with evidence of the ability to provide high- quality instruction. 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. Appointment as Senior Lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field that is appropriate to the subject matter that is to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high- quality performance. Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE (Full Time

Equivalent) below 50%. Criteria for appointment and reappointment in these ranks are identical to the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty at the same rank. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure), and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may be either compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. In other cases, the appointment is at a rank that is commensurate with the person's qualifications for a faculty appointment as determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

Appointment of tenure-track regional campus faculty is based on the same set of criteria that are used for appointments of Columbus tenure-track faculty. However, appointment of regional campus faculty considers the following three circumstances that are unique to regional campus faculty.

a. The primary function of a regional campus is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of its community. With this consideration in mind, the Department places greater emphasis on the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship in evaluating candidates for appointment as regional- campus faculty.
b. Tenure-track regional campus faculty are expected to establish a program of high- quality scholarly activity. However, the character and quantity of that activity may differ from that of Columbus tenure-track faculty because of the weight of other responsibilities and because of lack of access to comparable resources.
c. Teaching and service responsibilities of regional campus tenure-track faculty are often more substantial than those of Columbus tenure-track faculty.

With these three considerations in mind, the Department places greater emphasis on the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship in evaluating candidates for appointment as regional campus tenure-track faculty as compared to Columbus campus tenure-track faculty.

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

6. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-36. Full-time tenure track, professional practice, research, or associated faculty may request

emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Faculty send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department Chair outlining academic performance and service. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair decides upon the request, and (if appropriate) submits it to the Dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the reputation of the University or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B. PROCEDURES

As indicated in the following subsections, advisory faculty votes are required on various matters that are related to appointments. The creation of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty positions require prior approval of the Dean of the College.

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

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

1. Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

When a tenure-track faculty position is approved by the Dean of the College, a faculty search is initiated. 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 department.

A national/international search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the Office of Academic Affairs Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection. The Department Chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search as well as other fields within the Department (or departments in cases of planned joint appointments). The Department Chair designates a Committee Chair also.

The search committee is responsible for the following search-related activities.

- The committee develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the Office of Human Resources and external advertising, subject to approval of the chair of the department that initiates the search. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, because an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, and salary. Timing for the receipt of applications is stated as a preferred date.
- The committee develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. Advertising is rarely enough to create a pool of applicants. Networking and other forms of personal contact with those in a position to recommend or candidates are usually required.
- The search committee screens applications and letters of recommendation and recommends to the full faculty of the department that initiates the search a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) who are judged worthy of interview. If the faculty of the department that initiates the search agrees with this judgement, virtual or on- campus interviews are arranged by the committee chair. If the faculty of the department that initiates the search does not agree, the chair of the department that initiates the search, in consultation with the faculty of the departments involved in the search, determines the appropriate next steps (e.g., solicit new applications, review other applications already received, or cancel the search for the time being). In the case of searches targeting jointly appointed faculty, the department that initiates the search has responsibility in identifying candidates for interview, while all potential departments with joint appointments are to be included in the interview process.

Virtual or on-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the Department Chair (or chairs, in cases of joint appointments); director and staff of research centers that are relevant to the faculty position, and the Dean of the College or their designee (or colleges if more than one is involved in a joint appointment). In addition, each candidate makes a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research. The search committee provides a survey form or other mechanism to

obtain evaluative comments from all participants in the interview process in a systematic manner. All candidates interviewing for a position must follow the same interview format, and relevant accommodations for disability/impairment should be provided.

Following completion of virtual/on-campus interviews, the Department's tenure-track faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. The chair of the search committee provides a written report to the Department Chair summarizing the results of the search process and including the results of the ballot. A review and positive recommendation are required from the other department(s) involved in a joint appointment.

If the offer involves an appointment at the rank of either associate professor or professor, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty reviews the candidate's application and supporting documentation and makes a recommendation to the Department Chair about appointment at that rank and whether the appointment should include tenure or not. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The outcome of a vote of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty must be included in a written report to the Department Chair. Based on the recommendation of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean of the College regarding the rank and tenure of the candidate. This recommendation must include the vote and recommendation of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. If the Department Chair's recommendation deviates from that of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair must meet with Committee of the Eligible Faculty to explain his/her/their decision.

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support that is required to extend an offer, the chair of the department that initiated the search decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the chair of the department that initiated the search. The following must be submitted for review and approval by the Dean and administration of the College:

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

materials.

Potential appointment of a foreign national requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. An MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that each candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview should be on professional practice rather than research. All positions need to be posted on WorkDay and a national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates unless an exception is approved by the college dean.

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

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

3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. All positions need to be posted on WorkDay and a national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates unless an exception is approved by the college dean.

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

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 Dean of the College, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

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

Transfers from a professional practice 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/international searches for such positions.

5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the Department Chair, in consultation with the eligible faculty.

All positions need to be posted on WorkDay. Nominations for appointment of associated faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the Department. The proposal is submitted in writing to the Department Chair. The Department Chair notifies the candidate and the nominating faculty member of the decision in writing. A nomination may be rejected due to lack of qualifications on the part of the candidate, lack of space to host the proposed activity, insufficient resources, or insufficient contributions to the mission of the Department.

Associated appointments generally are made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be renewed formally to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years. Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on a semester-long basis, but can made for longer durations, as conditions warrant. A draft letter of offer to an associated faculty candidate must be submitted for review and approval by the administration of the College. After the initial appointment, and if the curricular needs of the Department warrant it, a multiple-year appointment may be offered.

6. Regional Campus Faculty

Each regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search. However, the Dean/Director of the regional campus (or their designee) consults with the Department Chair (or chairs in the case of proposed jointly appointed faculty) to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. Searches for regional campus faculty are performed using the same procedures that are applied to tenure-track faculty on the Columbus

campus. A search committee for tenure- track faculty at a regional campus must include at least one member from the Department.

Regional campus tenure-track faculty candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the Dean/Director of the regional campus, Department Chair, tenure-track faculty in the Department (or departments, in the case of a joint appointment), and the search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search that are not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the Department Chair and Dean/Director of the regional campus. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the Department Chair and the regional campus dean.

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

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

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty member from another department within the University. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this Department justifying the appointment will be considered by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Upon approval of the appointment by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair will extend an offer of appointment. A copy of the offer letter, which is accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae, is submitted to the administration of the College. The Department Chair reviews all courtesy appointments at least every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for non-renewal before the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for a vote.

Courtesy appointments are warranted only if they are accompanied by substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department. Criteria for appointment should include the expectations for such involvement. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal, but continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing involvement.

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the University Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment, which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. The purpose of the review is to provide constructive feedback, in writing, to the faculty member about their performance and an assessment of the general progress toward their goals and contributions to the mission of the Department. The period of review is

aligned with the calendar year and goes from January 1st through December 31st. The annual reviews are based, as appropriate to appointment type, on an assessment of contributions in teaching, graduate student advising, scholarship, research funding, National/International service, and local service, and on any additional assignments and goals that are specific to the individual; on progress toward promotion (where relevant); and on activities that enhance the culture of the college and department, in keeping with the values of the university and college. The annual review provides also the basis for merit salary increases that are specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion (where relevant). Faculty will be rated on the following scale:

- **Exceeds Expectations** – Performance substantially surpasses the stated responsibilities and criteria of the faculty role. Evidence demonstrates exceptional achievement and significant contributions beyond what is normally expected.
- **Meets Expectations** – Performance fulfills the stated responsibilities and criteria of the faculty role. Evidence demonstrates consistent, effective achievement at the standard level expected of faculty.
- **Does Not Meet Expectations** – Performance falls short of the stated responsibilities and criteria of the faculty role. Evidence demonstrates deficiencies in achievement that do not meet the standard expected of faculty.

In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the Department Chairs or Directors for all of the units to which the faculty member is appointed, must agree on the review recommendations. The written evaluation is to be prepared by the Department Chair of the candidate's primary Tenure- Initiating Unit and signed by all the Chairs or Directors. Specific documentation requirements in the areas of teaching, research, creative work, scholarship, and service are to be determined by the primary Tenure-Initiating Unit. In the case of an Associate Professor, this assessment gauges progress to promotion to Professor. In the case of a Professor this assessment is gauged towards contributions to the Departments in which appointments are held, the University, and the discipline.

Per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, the Department Chair is required to include a reminder in the annual review letter that each faculty member has the right, per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. DOCUMENTATION

For the annual performance and merit review, the following documents must be submitted to the Department Chair no later than the end of February:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Policies and Procedures Handbook, Volume 3; this is required for probationary faculty and recommended for associate professors.
- All nonprobationary faculty must submit updated documentation of performance and accomplishments via forms developed by the department administration.
- All faculty must have an updated CV, which is submitted annually along with the

annual review.

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

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

B. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Department Chair. The Department Chair then meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and, as appropriate, plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. In cases of joint appointments, if the Department Chair of the faculty member's tenure initiating unit recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on plans and goals. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this letter should include input from all the appointed units. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of units to which the faculty member has been appointed. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The
Department Chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the College to which the Tenure-Initiating Unit belongs. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if they choose to provide them).

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 Dean of the College for review. The Dean of the College makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are not solicited with the one exception as noted below, and the Dean of the College (not the Department Chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment. External evaluations are only solicited when either the Department Chair or the Committee of the Eligible Faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary,

or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the Department Chair of other units in which the faculty member holds appointments should be consulted as an additional source of evaluation in determining whether external evaluations should be solicited.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate and then votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty prepares a report summarizing the recommendation and the results of a vote of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The Department Chair independently prepares a recommendation. At the conclusion of the department review, per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, the formal comments process is followed and the results of the Department-level review are forwarded to the College of Engineering for review, regardless of whether the Department Chair recommends renewal or non-renewal. The Department Chair of the department in which the faculty member's primary appointment is held must state clearly in the review the expectations of specific achievements in teaching, research, scholarship, and service that the faculty member needs to accomplish before being recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

2. Changes to the Length of the Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure- track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period, and the procedures for obtaining the necessary approvals of requests to exclude time. Faculty Rule 3335-6- 03(F) does likewise for extensions of the probationary period. The faculty member remains on duty regardless of time excluded from or extended to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time excluded or extended. Approved exclusions or extensions do not limit the Department's right to recommend non-renewal of appointment during an annual review. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook.

C. TENURED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

Annual reviews of tenured faculty include a written objective assessment of the faculty member's progress in teaching, scholarship, and service. In the case of an Associate Professor, this assessment gauges progress to promotion to Professor. In the case of a Professor this assessment is gauged towards contributions to the Department, the University, and the discipline. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these reviews include assessments from all departments within the College of Engineering to which the faculty member has been appointed.

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

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. Professors meet with the Department Chair to discuss performance and future plans and goals upon request by either the faculty member or the department chair. The Department Chair prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest- ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

The Department Chair's evaluations will be provided to faculty members not later than July 31. A copy of this report is placed in each faculty member's personnel file.

Any response also becomes part of the faculty member's personnel file.

D. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

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

1. Annual Review for Professional Practice Faculty

For professional practice faculty, an annual performance and merit review meeting with the primary appointment Chair or School Director is required to discuss their performance, plans, and goals. The primary appointment Department Chair or School Director must prepare a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew if the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment tenure- initiating units (TIUs) and is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College.

2. Appointment Renewal (Contract Renewal) for Professional Practice Faculty

In the penultimate contract year of a professional practice faculty member's appointment, the primary appointment Department Chair or School Director must

determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

Probationary professional practice faculty must undergo a review no later than the beginning of the penultimate year of their contract so the unit may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that individual's appointment for a new term. The review will follow the same procedures as for an appointment renewal for tenure track faculty, i.e.: a Fourth-year review process. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The college dean has the final approval on the reappointment. Positive decisions will be approved by OAA without a review, and this decision is communicated to OAA using only the Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form with no attachments. The Board of Trustees has final approval, after which the faculty member is no longer probationary. If the individual will not be renewed the faculty member should be so informed, subject to the relevant standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08.

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

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

E. RESEARCH FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

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

1. Annual Review for Research Faculty

For research faculty, a meeting with the primary appointment Chair or School Director is required to discuss their performance, plans, and goals. The Department Chair must prepare a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew if the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary

appointment TIUs and is to be signed by all heads of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College.

2. Appointment Renewal (Contract Renewal) for Research Faculty
In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the Department Chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue.

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

There is no presumption of contract renewal.

Probationary research faculty must undergo a review no later than the beginning of the penultimate year of their contract so the unit may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that individual's appointment for a new term. The review will follow the same procedures as for an appointment renewal for tenure track faculty, i.e., a Fourth-year- review process. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The college dean has the final approval on the reappointment. Positive decisions will be approved by OAA without a review, and this decision is communicated to OAA using only the Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form with no attachments. The Board of Trustees has final approval, after which the faculty member is no longer probationary.

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

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

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

F. ASSOCIATED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

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

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

In the penultimate contract year of a compensated associated faculty member with a multiple- year appointment, the Department Chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice that are set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

There is no presumption of renewal of contract. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review follows the review procedures for promotion of professional practice faculty. The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the Department Chair, in consultation with the eligible faculty.

G. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

Annual performance and merit review of a probationary tenure-track or tenured regional campus faculty member is conducted first on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. Then the review moves to the Department in which the primary appointment is held and proceeds as described above for probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty, respectively, on the Columbus campus. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the Department, the Department Chair discusses the matter with the Dean/Director of the regional campus, to clarify and reconcile the divergence. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these discussions are to include the chairs or directors of all the departments to which the faculty member has been appointed.

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

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

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

H. SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Department Chair

divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal-equity issues. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section V-A, above) 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.

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

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

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

In general, individuals will be recommended for promotion in rank, or promotion in rank with tenure, based on demonstrated and documented excellence in contributions supporting the mission of the Department. No individual will be promoted or granted tenure without the full expectation that the action will serve to improve the quality of the Department's faculty and programs.

A. CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
(or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor)

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) provides the following general criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

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

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

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

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

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is, moreover, defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement of Professional Ethics.

The criteria and evidence listed below in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. In the evaluation of untenured Associate Professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others that were established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Examples of evidence may be in the following forms:

• Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm. • Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other instructional strategies to create an optimal learning environment. • Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation. • Demonstrated continuing growth in subject- matter knowledge. • Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge-creation process. • Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process. • Treated students with respect and courtesy. • Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs. • Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise. • Assisted graduate students in the production of high-quality scholarly outputs. • Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching. • Where appropriate, developed interdisciplinary courses across multiple departments, schools and colleges in the case of jointly appointed faculty.	• Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, case studies, and/or problem sets that demonstrate current subject content. • Peer teaching evaluations supporting that the material covered in a course and the class evaluation items are well organized. • Peer teaching evaluations supporting the material is delivered effectively and with enthusiasm. • Descriptions of how and when students are provided feedback on their academic performance. • Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports, including student comments and trends over time. • A list of the graduate students advised and, where applicable, descriptions of their culminating projects including theses and dissertations. • A list of peer-reviewed publications based upon graduate students' theses or dissertations. • A list of awards given to graduate or undergraduate advisees based on their scholarly work with the adviser. • A list of programs/events attended that aimed to improve teaching (e.g., through Drake Institute). • Evidence of staying current through participation in continuing education on topics or focus areas and adopting new course materials to update the curriculum. • List of interdisciplinary courses developed with details on which departments they are cross- listed with, distribution of students from different departments, etc.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria**

	Have Been Met
Candidates must have:	Examples of evidence may be in the following forms:
a. Published a body of work in high- quality peer reviewed venues that are thematically focused, substantively contributes to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise shown evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered in evaluating this criterion. i. Quality and impact of work are more important than quantity of work. ii. The body of work making unique contribution(s) to a line of inquiry. iii. Student participation in publishing the body of work. iv. Rigor of the peer-review process and the degree of dissemination of publication venues. Patents, archival journal publications, and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research is weighted more heavily than unpublished research that is currently under review, and original works are weighted more heavily than edited works. v. Collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry. The candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be described clearly and fairly to permit accurate	• A body of work in peer reviewed journals, or other journals consistent with the standards of the candidate's areas of expertise. Publications demonstrate research/scholarship that contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. • Presentations at high quality conferences that clearly demonstrate the candidate's success in developing a research/scholarship/creative program over time that contributes substantively to knowledge/outcomes in their focus areas. • List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly or creative works. • Other evidence of impact on the field or area of focus. • External evaluator comments regarding impact and quality of research. • Complete publication record including archival journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. • A record of obtaining sustained research grants and contracts from foundations, federal agencies, major industries. Candidate may have served as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator with documented contributions on their grants or projects.

assessment. vi. Nontraditional yet impactful ways of transferring knowledge (for instance, patents and TED talks) are considered. b. A demonstrated ability to obtain and	• White papers that can be shown to have influenced policy or practice.
sustain research program funding. Research funding is a means to an end and funding must lead to demonstrated research productivity. c. Developed a National/International reputation in the candidate's field. A reputation that is based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one that is based mainly on familiarity through the candidate's frequent attendance at national and international conferences. d. Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research, including but not limited to full and timely adherence to all regulations that are relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, collaborators, and, where applicable, research participants. e. Demonstrated a vision for how his or her individual area of scholarly excellence contributes to advancing the research strategy of the Department, the College of Engineering, and the university. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this vision should include considerations of the research strategies of the units to which the candidate has been appointed.	• Other creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus. • Evidence of works in progress. • Invitations to present at recognized prestigious conferences or workshops (e.g., keynote or plenary speakers). • Evidence of research leadership (e.g., journal editorships, invitations to participate in national committees).

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have	Examples of evidence may be in the following forms:

a. Made substantive contributions to the governance and/or operations of the Department, College of Engineering, and University in a collegial manner that supports positive contributions by others,
 	
b. Demonstrated useful contributions to the profession through National/International service.
	• Descriptions of service contributions and resulting outcomes.
	• Recognition (awards and prizes) for service
	• Annual evaluations document excellence in service to TIU, the College of Engineering, or the University such as:
	  • Committee participation,
	  • Administrative positions held,
	  • Organizational leadership,
	  • Mentoring activities.
	
	• Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include:
	  • Editorships of or service as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications.
	  • Leadership positions held and other service to professional societies
	  • Development of mechanisms to help bring people into the profession,
	  • Organization of and service to conferences, workshops, and symposia (e.g., organizing technical sessions, etc.)
	  • Evidence of the provision of expertise to public and private entities beyond the university includes reviewer of proposals, external examiner, service on panels and commissions for government, and educational institutions.
	• Documented community service activities:
	• Professional expertise provided as a compensated outside professional is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

Integration

By necessity, the evaluation of faculty performance considers the dimensions of teaching, graduate student advising, scholarship, and service. The ideal, however, is an individual who balances and integrates these activities into a synergistic whole. The integration of teaching, graduate student advising, scholarship, and service to maximize the impact of the individual activities on the Department, College, University, and society is valued highly.

Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor.

> *Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service both locally (Department, College and/or University) and Nationally/Internationally.*

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for faculty, for students, and for the profession. The specific criteria in instruction, scholarship, and service for promotion to Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, with the added expectation and proof of sustained accomplishment and increased quality of contributions in terms of scholarly work and research funding, as well as a record of continuing professional growth. This is evidenced by both local and national/international service and evidence of an established national or international reputation in the field. When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, creative activities in outreach and engagement are valued. Criteria for promotion to Professor take into account the guidelines that are specified by Faculty Rules 3335-6-02(C) and (D). This includes exercising reasonable flexibility in assessing teaching, scholarship, and service activities that take into account the reality that faculty may have heavier and lighter commitments in one area relative to another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university. In addition, as the University enters new fields of endeavor, instances may arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established or traditional academic patterns.

2. Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty

All professional practice faculty must:

- **a.** be engaged in teaching, the development of the Department's academic programs, and the mentoring of students;
- **b.** contribute to the scholarly mission of the Department, College, and University;

and

c. contribute to service needs of the Department

The instructional activities of professional practice faculty must be consistent with the rationale for having professional practice faculty in the Department—these consist of courses that involve the professional practice of engineering. The scholarly emphasis of professional practice faculty is expected to be different from that of tenure-track and research faculty. Professional-practice faculty are more engaged in activities that deal with the state of the professional practice of engineering, while tenure-track and research faculty are more engaged in activities that advance the state-of-the-art and science of engineering. Professional practice faculty are expected to deliver high-quality education in their teaching, academic-program development, and student mentorship.

For promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate the following.

a. A record of recognition at a national or international level in the broader engineering-education community as well as the industrial engineering-education community. To achieve this, the individual is encouraged to publish scholarly papers in the engineering-education literature (and where appropriate the broader education literature) and provide significant national/international service.
b. A record of providing up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject-matter knowledge.
c. The ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm.
d. Creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other instructional strategies to create an optimal learning environment.
e. Engagement of students in the learning process and encouragement of independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge-creation process.
f. Provision of appropriate and timely feedback to students through the instructional process.
g. Treatment of students with respect and courtesy.
h. Improvement of curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs.
i. Engagement in documentable efforts to improve teaching.
j. As appropriate, developed interdisciplinary courses across multiple departments, schools, and colleges in the case of jointly appointed faculty.
k. Contribution to the Department's student mentorship.
l. Promise of continued professional growth.

Specific criteria in instruction and service for promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor are those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

For promotion to Professional Practice Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for faculty, for students, and for the profession. The specific criteria in instruction, scholarship, and service for promotion to Professional Practice Professor are similar to those for promotion to Professional Practice Associate

Professor, with the added expectation and proof of sustained accomplishment and increased quality of contributions in terms of instruction and a record of continuing professional growth. This is evidenced by both local and national/international service and established local and national/international reputation in instruction.

3. Promotion of Research Faculty

All research faculty must:

- **a.** be engaged in the mentoring of students, particularly graduate students,
- **b.** develop a record of scholarship, and
- **c.** contribute to effective service to the Department.

Classroom instruction is not required of research faculty. However, research faculty members are expected to be engaged in instructional activities that develop the research capabilities of graduate students. The preponderance of the effort of research faculty is expected to be devoted to scholarship activities. Professional service activities (national/international service) are expected of research faculty, while administrative service activities would be expected to focus on tasks that are consistent with the faculty member's scholarly expertise.

For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research that is consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous funding is required along with evidence of a growing national/international reputation.

For promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation, which is built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

4. Promotion of Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

5. Promotion of Regional Campus Faculty

Promotion of tenure-track regional campus faculty is based on the same set of criteria that are used for promotion of Columbus campus tenure-track faculty. However, promotion of regional campus faculty considers the following three circumstances that are unique to regional campus faculty.

a. The primary function of a regional campus is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of its community. With this consideration in mind, the Department places greater emphasis on the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion.

b. Regional campus faculty are expected to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity. However, the character and quantity of that activity may differ from that of tenure-track faculty because of the weight of other responsibilities and because of lack of access to comparable resources.

c. Teaching and service responsibilities of regional campus faculty are often more substantial than those of Columbus campus tenure-track faculty.

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

B. PROCEDURES

The Department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those that are set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and the Office of Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, which are found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. The following sections state the responsibilities of each party to the review process. Appendix A (Section X) provides the ANNUAL MILESTONES and timeline for some of these responsibilities.

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

a. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and indicating the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. 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.

Dossier

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

Any published materials that are presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that

documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication. Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

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

Instruction/Teaching

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

Documentation of instruction and teaching should include the following.

- Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction reports, which are prepared by the Office of the University Registrar, for every class taught.
- A year-by-year summary of the SEI reports (both quantitative and narrative components) prepared by a faculty member other than the candidate.
- Peer Evaluation of Teaching reports as required in Section IX PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING.
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books, or other materials published or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Teaching activities listed in the core dossier, which includes:
  - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research;
  - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers;
  - extension and continuing education instruction;
  - involvement in curriculum development;
  - awards and formal recognition of teaching;
  - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences; and
  - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities.
- Other relevant documentation of instructional activities, as appropriate.

Scholarship/Creative Works

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for

probationary faculty) or date of last promotion (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence (from Ph.D. and/or post-doctoral advisors) over time. There should be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcome over time.

Documentation of scholarship should include the following:

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

Service

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

Service activities listed in the core dossier include:

- involvement with professional journals and professional societies,
- involvement with study groups to the federal government and National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine,
- consultation activity with industry, education, or government,
- practice services,
- administrative service to the Department,
- administrative service to the College of Engineering,
- administrative service to the University,
- advising to student groups and organizations,
- awards and prizes for service to the profession, University, College of Engineering, or Department, and

- any other available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

The complete dossier, including the documentation of instruction noted below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the Department. 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.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

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

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

External Evaluations (see also External Evaluations below)

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The candidate may add no more than three names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of two evaluators, and in the case of such a request, shall provide written reasons for each request. The Department Chair in consultation with the tenured professors within the specialty area decides whether removal is justified.

2. Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

All promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are conducted by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, as specified in Section III.A.1-3 DEFINITIONS. Thus, there is no separate Promotion and Tenure Committee for such reviews. The Department Chair may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions but may not vote.

The responsibilities of the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty are as follows:

a. Where relevant, to determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the committee chair must 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. The MOU should articulate that the faculty member understands that they will be afforded all protections of tenure, with the exception that should their right to work in the United States be revoked, their position and tenure will be terminated.

b. To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which a case is to be discussed and voted upon.

c. To request, in consultation with the department chair, the removal of any member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

d. As needed, to form a subcommittee to help with the process of evaluation.

e. To oversee the procedures and make sure timelines stated in Appendix A (Section X) are adhered to.

The responsibilities of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty are as follows.

a. To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.

b. To consider annually, in accordance with the timeline in Appendix A, requests from faculty members seeking a nonmandatory 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. Sixty percent of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed. In making such a decision, the following guidelines apply.

i. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty bases this decision on an assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's current dossier, other documents requested by the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, and all required documentation for a full review (e.g., student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a nonmandatory review.

ii. 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 nonprobationary professional practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

iii. A decision by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to permit a review to take place in no way commits the faculty, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

iv. Annually, during the Spring Semester, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty elects a Procedures Oversight Designee, with responsibilities that are described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, Volume 3. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

c. To suggest to the Department Chair external evaluators, as necessary for review of

any candidate. Section VI.B.6 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS provides further details on requirements for soliciting and obtaining external evaluations.

d. To review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

e. To meet, as necessary, with each candidate for clarification and to provide the candidate with comments on their dossier. This meeting is *not* an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

f. To meet, as necessary, to review and discuss each candidate and vote on the appointment, promotion, or tenure decision that is under consideration.

g. To provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair of any appointment, promotion, or tenure decision that is under consideration by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

h. To provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure resides in another TIU.

i. To provide a written response, on behalf of the full Committee of the Eligible Faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

The responsibilities of individual members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty are to:

a. review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case is discussed,

b. attend all committee meetings, except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance,

c. participate in the discussion of every case, and

d. vote on every case.

3. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows.

a. To solicit external evaluations from a list which includes names that are suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, and the candidate. Section VI.B.6 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS provides further details on requirements for soliciting and obtaining external evaluations.

b. To solicit internal letters of evaluation, such as from the head of a joint TIU or Discovery Theme lead.

c. To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.

d. To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

e. To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

f. To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the evaluation and recommendation of the

Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

g. To meet with the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the Committee's recommendation.

h. To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the Department-review process of:

i. the recommendations by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair,

ii. the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair, and

iii. the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier.

i. To include in the written letter to the candidate, a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether the candidate expects to submit comments.

j. To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

k. To forward the completed dossier to the College of Engineering by that office's deadline.

l. To receive the Committee of the Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees whose tenure resides in another TIU, and to forward this material, along with the Department Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the chair of the other TIU by the date that is requested.

4. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

5. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

Regional campus professional practice faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean/Director. Following the review, the Dean/Director consults with the Department Chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track

faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

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

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

6. External Evaluations

External evaluations are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed, and for all promotion reviews in which national and/or international recognition is expected. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research contract renewal and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for professional practice or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations to assess the research of a professional practice or associated faculty member will be made by the Department Chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

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

A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A useful evaluation must provide sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A credible evaluation must have the following properties:

a. It must be written by a person who is highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant). It is expected that the reviewer has published extensively in the candidate's area of study and is considered a nationally and internationally recognized researcher in the candidate's field of study. Additional desirable attributes could include being
   - a member of the National Academy of Engineering,
   - a fellow of a professional society,
   - a faculty member at an institution of similar or higher rankings.

b. Evaluations cannot be written by a close friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or doctoral mentor of the candidate.

A list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, and the candidate. The candidate can suggest no more than three external evaluators to the Department Chair and Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty will suggest at least five additional external evaluators to the Department Chair and provide a current evaluator report form with biographical information and a description of the qualifications of each suggested evaluator. The Department Chair will add at least three additional evaluators to the list. The candidate may request that an evaluator suggested by the Committee of Eligible Faculty or Department Chair be removed but the request must be justified in writing. The Department Chair in consultation with the Eligible Faculty within the specialty area determines whether removal of an evaluator is justified. A candidate cannot request the removal of an evaluator solely because they anticipate receiving a negative evaluation. A total of at least eight evaluators will be selected by the Department Chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, with at most three from the list that is suggested by the candidate and with at least three from the list that is recommended by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. 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 the Office of Academic Affairs nor the Department require that the dossier contain letters from evaluators that are suggested by the candidate.

It is expected that the complete list will include distinguished academics and highly qualified practitioners who are able to evaluate the quality, relevance, and impact of the candidate's work. It is preferable that evaluations be sought from departments that are at least as prominent in academic rankings as this department. The Department Chair is responsible for contacting the evaluators and obtaining the letters of evaluation. The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found here. A sample letter for professional practice faculty can be found here.

The evaluators will be provided with a copy of the draft of the dossier and copies of the documentation of the three to five most significant scholarly contributions that have been produced by the candidate. The candidate is responsible for selecting and providing this documentation. The evaluators are asked to comment on:

- the candidate's impact on the field through their program of instruction, scholarship, and service,
- the significance of the candidate's overall program of scholarship,
- the originality and quality of the candidate's work, and
- a comparison of the candidate to others in the field at approximately the same stage of career development.

The Department Chair and Committee of the Eligible Faculty must consider all responses from the evaluators when evaluating the candidate. All responses must be included in the dossier. If concerns arise about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the department's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact

in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the 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 the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier. It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapses, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

VII. APPEALS

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

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

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh-year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth-year (mandatory tenure) review.

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members may optionally provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a computer or mobile application. If a faculty member elects to do so, they should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high, must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation, and should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The Department Chair oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process. The Department's Peer Evaluation of Teaching document (see Appendix B) specifies the frequency at which each faculty member must have a peer evaluation of their teaching. However, any
faculty member may make a request of the Department Chair to have an optional peer evaluation of teaching conducted as they see fit. The Department's Peer Evaluation of Teaching document also specifies the teaching evaluation process.

The Department Chair appoints at least two faculty members to conduct an evaluation of each faculty member requiring or requesting one. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute peer teaching evaluation service among the faculty to support and encourage attention to the

quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

X. APPENDIX A: TABLES OF ANNUAL MILESTONES

Table of Milestones for Promotion & Tenure

Date	Milestone
September 1	The candidate must inform the Department Chair of their desire to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the following calendar year. This timeline is to ensure that the candidate's peer teaching evaluations are or will be completed by the end of Spring semester.
May 1	Materials from the candidate considered for promotion and/or tenure for a pre-evaluation. The materials should include dossier, summary relevant information, etc. as requested by the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, as well as references suggested by the candidate, meeting the criteria specified in Section VI.B.5 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS.
May 15	Pre-evaluation of the materials and all suggested references (candidate, eligible faculty, and department chair) for promotion and/or tenure.
June 10	Dossiers due to Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty from all candidates for promotion and tenure and reference selection process finalized.
July 10	Letters from outside evaluators for all candidates for promotion and tenure requested by department chair based on a list compiled by candidate, promotion and tenure committee, and department chair.
August 15	Outside evaluation letters due.
September 15	Completed P&T package for all candidates for promotion and tenure are assembled.
~September 30 (based on College of Engineering Timelines)	Latest date for candidate to be notified in writing of the completion of the TIU Review and of the availability of the reports from the TIU P&T Committee and the TIU.
~October 10 (based on College of Engineering Timelines)	Per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(B)(5), "The candidate may provide the tenure initiating unit chair with written comments on the tenure initiating unit review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review."
~October 25 (based on College of Engineering Timelines)	Nominations for promotion and tenure submitted to the college by the department chair according to college and university timetable.

Table of Milestones for Fourth Year Review

Date	Milestone
November 30	Completed dossiers and other materials requested by the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty due from all untenured faculty preparing for a fourth-year review.
January 15	Reviews of fourth-year materials completed by eligible faculty.
~February 3 (based on College of Engineering Timelines)	Latest date for candidate to be notified in writing of the completion of the TIU Review and of the availability of the reports from the TIU P&T Committee and the TIU.
~February 13 (based on College of Engineering Timelines)	Per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(B)(5), "The candidate may provide the tenure initiating unit chair with written comments on the tenure initiating unit review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review."
~February 24 (based on College of Engineering Timelines)	Nominations for promotion and tenure submitted to the college by the department chair according to college and university timetable.

The dates are suggested and could be subject to change based on College of Engineering and University timelines.

XI. APPENDIX B: PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Department of Integrated Systems Engineering Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Purpose

Peer review of instructors informs faculty decisions about teaching expectations and standards; improves teaching practices; ensures curricular integrity across courses within and between programs; and provides insights about department and program instructional goals, outcomes, and measures. This is part of an on-going effort to improve the quality of teaching and can support teaching practice effectiveness required for promotion and tenure. The peer evaluation of teaching requirements that are specified in this document apply to tenure-track faculty whose
tenure resides within the Department of Integrated Systems Engineering (the "Department") and professional practice faculty and lecturers who are employed by the Department.

B. Details of Selection and Administration

1. Required Evaluations

Peer evaluation of teaching is required of the following faculty and lecturers with the following frequency.

- Tenure-Track and Professional Practice Assistant Professors and Untenured Tenure- Track Associate Professors: At least once annually.

- Tenured Tenure-Track and Professional Practice Associate Professors: At least once annually for at least two consecutive years prior to seeking promotion to professor.
- Lecturers: At least once during the first year contract year.
- Anyone else serving in any instructional capacity within the Department: As deemed necessary by the Department Chair.

Anyone who serves in any instructional capacity within the Department may submit a written request to the Department Chair to have a peer evaluation of teaching conducted. The Department Chair has discretion to approve such a request, depending on availability of Department resources to conduct the evaluation.

2. Selection of Evaluators

For each peer evaluation of teaching, the Department Chair selects at least two tenure-track or professional practice faculty members from the Department to conduct the evaluation. Although efforts will be made to have evaluations conducted by faculty at equal or higher rank, this is not guaranteed. The Department Chair may also request a peer evaluator from another department. Once the evaluation team is selected, the Department Chair will determine which courses that the instructor is teaching (if the instructor is teaching multiple courses) are to be evaluated.

C. Evaluation Process:

The evaluation follows a four-step process, which is to be completed within a single semester. A multi-semester peer evaluation of teaching can be conducted, at the discretion of the Department Chair (e.g., for a candidate teaching a course sequence that spans multiple semesters). This process should be followed for each course that is being evaluated.

1. Step 1: Background Discussion

The goal of the background discussion is to gain understanding of the instructor's approach to teaching. This discussion should be held between the instructor and peer evaluators at least one week prior to conducting course evaluation. Appendix C provides a standard questionnaire, which can be used to guide this discussion.

In preparation for this discussion, the instructor should gather and make available to the peer reviewers the following information.

a. Course syllabus
b. Course materials (e.g., textbook, handouts, reading materials)
c. Sample assignments, projects, quizzes, or examinations
d. Media used for information dissemination (e.g., Carmen, Slack, Twitter)
e. Discussion of difficulties in teaching and concepts with which students tend to struggle
f. Feedback of students' perceptions of the course (e.g., Student Evaluations of Instruction or Small-Group Instructional Diagnostics)
g. Steps taken by the instructor to address student feedback, improve teaching, alleviate student educational challenges
h. Methods that the peer evaluators should use to assess the teaching

2. Step 2: Evaluation of Course Materials

Following the background discussion, materials that are used in the course should be evaluated. Appendix D provides a standard table, which can be used in conducting this evaluation.

3. Step 3: Classroom Observation

Following the first two steps, each peer evaluator should conduct at least one classroom observation of each course. To the extent possible, the evaluators should observe more than one classroom session each and conduct their classroom observations on different dates. Appendix E provides a standard table, which can be used in conducting classroom observations.

4. Step 4: Final Evaluation, Discussion, and Review

Based on the information that is gathered by the peer evaluators in the first three steps, they should draft a written evaluation report. This report should focus on summarizing strengths and any areas of potential improvement in terms of course organization, materials, and classroom conduct. To the extent possible, the report should provide clear and concrete examples. Moreover, specific recommendations or strategies for improving any perceived weaknesses with respect to instruction should be provided.

Once the report has been written, the peer evaluators should schedule a final discussion with the instructor. This final discussion should be used to provide additional feedback and answer any follow-on questions regarding the peer evaluation. The instructor should also be explicitly told (and the written report should state) that the instructor has the opportunity to provide written feedback on the peer evaluation report.

Once the peer evaluation report is finalized, it should be sent to the Department Chair for inclusion in the instructor's personnel file.

XII. APPENDIX C: BACKGROUND DISCUSSION QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Learning Objectives

- What are the learning objectives for the course?
- What are the learning objectives for the class session that will be observed?

B. Syllabus

- How is the course structured?
- What is important about the way that the course is structured?
- What is important about the topics?

C. Assignments

- What are some of the key assignments and assessment mechanisms for the course?
- What skills or knowledge are these assignments and assessment mechanisms designed to assess?
- Does student performance suggest that they are gaining mastery of the topic? If not,

what are deficiencies in their understanding?

D. Materials
- What materials are used in the course?
- How are these materials used in the course?

E. Student Performance
- How do student perform with respect the learning objectives?
- What content areas, assignments, assessment mechanisms, or learning objectives are challenging for students?
- What content areas, assignments, assessment mechanisms, or learning objectives do student perform well on?
- What has the instructor done to improve areas where students struggle?

F. Teaching-Improvement Strategies
- What strategies has the instructor used to improve their teaching (e.g., changes based on student feedback or consultation with University Center for Advancement of Teaching)?
- What strategies has the instructor used to make educational innovations (e.g., National Effective Teaching Institute)?

G. Classroom Observation
- What day(s) would be best for classroom observation?
- What is expected to occur on those day(s)?
- Is there anything that the reviewers should understand about the classroom or the way that the course is conducted? Does the classroom layout or do other factors facilitate or interfere with instruction?

XIII. APPENDIX D: EVALUATION OF COURSE MATERIALS

	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective	Comments
1. Syllabus and Course Requirements: - logically organized - necessary information provided - appropriate workload for course level and credit of units				
2. Assignments and Assessment Mechanisms: - provide clear instructions - align with course content - set at appropriate rigor level - provide clear evaluation standards (e.g., rubric) - weighted appropriately				
3. Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes - clearly stated - appropriate for course level - align with Department's program goals - consistent with Department's course expectations				

4. Material Organization - clear organization - effective use of Carmen or other media for material dissemination				
5. Student Performance - students are given opportunities to gain mastery of course topics - modifications to teaching approach to address gaps				
6. Teaching Improvement - strategies to improve this course based on student and other feedback				

XIV. APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION AND EVALUATION

	Needs improvement	Effective	Highly Effective	Comments
1. Content Delivery - concepts explained clearly - material presented at appropriate pace and level - lecture is supported by appropriate supplemental material (e.g., discussion, hand-outs, examples)				
2. Content Knowledge - clearly demonstrates superior knowledge of the course content and materials - material that is being taught is appropriate to the course and its learning objectives				

3. Student Engagement - is the classroom well managed to facilitate learning? - does the instructor use mechanisms to engage students effectively?				