



Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Document

Department of Materials Science and Engineering

Updated on August 28, 2025

Approved by Faculty: October 15, 2025

Approved by College of Engineering: November 19, 2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: December 1, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE	4
II. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION	4
III. DEFINITIONS	5
<i>A. Committee of the eligible faculty</i>	5
1. Tenure-track faculty	5
2. Professional Practice faculty	5
3. Professional practice faculty – regional campus	6
4. Research faculty	6
5. Associated faculty	7
6. Conflict of interest	7
7. Minimum composition	8
<i>B. Promotion and tenure committee (PT)</i>	8
<i>C. Quorum</i>	9
<i>D. Recommendation from the committee of the eligible faculty</i>	9
IV. APPOINTMENTS	10
<i>A. Criteria</i>	10
1. Tenure-track faculty	10
2. Professional practice faculty	12
3. Professional practice faculty – regional campus	13
4. Research faculty	13
5. Associated faculty	14
6. Emeritus faculty	16
7. Joint appointments	166
8. Courtesy appointments for faculty	16
<i>B. Procedures</i>	16
1. Tenure-track faculty	17
2. Professional practice faculty	19
3. Professional practice faculty – regional campus	19
4. Research faculty	19
5. Transfer from tenure-track	20
6. TIU transfer	20
7. Associated faculty	20
8. Joint Appointments	21
9. Courtesy appointments for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty	21
V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES	21
<i>A. Documentation</i>	22
<i>B. Probationary tenure-track faculty</i>	23
1. Fourth-year review	24
2. Extension of the tenure clock	25
<i>C. Tenured faculty</i>	25
<i>D. Professional practice faculty on the Columbus campus</i>	26
<i>E. Professional practice faculty – regional campus</i>	27
<i>F. Research faculty</i>	27
<i>G. Associated Faculty</i>	27
<i>H. Salary Recommendations</i>	28

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	28
<i>A. Criteria and evidence that support prormotion</i>	<i>28</i>
1. Promotion to associate professor with tenure	34
2. Promotion to professor	35
3. Promotion of professional practice faculty	37
4. Promotion of professional practice faculty – regional campus	38
5. Promotion of research faculty	38
6. Associated faculty	40
<i>B. Procedures</i>	<i>40</i>
1. Tenure-track faculty	40
a) Mandatory review	40
b) Non-mandatory review	42
2. Professional practice faculty	43
3. Professional practice faculty – regional campus	44
4. Research faculty	44
5. Responsibilities of tenure-track, professional practicee, and resarch faculty on the Columbus campus	44
a) Candidate	44
b) PT committee	47
c) Eligible faculty	49
d) Department chair	49
<i>C. Procedures for associated faculty</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>D. Procedures for regional campus professional practice faculty</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>E. External evaluators</i>	<i>51</i>
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPONITMENT APPEALS	553
VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	54
IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	55
<i>A. Student evaluation of teaching</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>B. Peer mentorship and evaluation of teaching</i>	<i>55</i>
Appendix A. Timetable for the annual and promotion/tenure review process	57

I. PREAMBLE

In this Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document, The Department of Materials Science and Engineering (MSE) shall describe, in qualitative terms, the departmental criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure within the context of the departmental mission. This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

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

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

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION

Our mission is to: create, transfer, and preserve knowledge through impactful research, dynamic teaching, and the effective training of future colleagues in materials science and engineering. We believe that learning, discovery, and innovation are fostered through the interaction of persons regardless of background and are dedicated to creating an environment that welcomes and values all.

Our vision is the creation of an environment that brings together people and ideas and advances materials science and engineering and welding engineering through a process of discovery and learning. We seek to create impact that is tangible and significant with excellence that is obvious.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the eligible faculty

For all cases below, the committee of eligible faculty excludes: all faculty whose primary appointment or tenure does not reside in the department; the chair of the department; the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college; the executive vice president and provost; and the president. In this document, nonprobationary professional practice or research faculty members are those who have been reappointed beyond the initial (probationary) period (see Sections IV.A.2 and IV.A.3 for professional practice and research faculty, respectively).

1. Tenure-track faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2. Professional Practice faculty

Professional practice faculty in the DMSE are referred to as Professional Practice Instructor, Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. The committee of the eligible faculty for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of professional practice faculty is defined as follows:

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a professional practice assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the department.

- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Professional Practice faculty – regional campus

The committee of the eligible faculty for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of professional practice faculty on a regional campus is identical to that on the Columbus Campus.

4. Research faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

5. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- **Appointment Review.** For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of a compensated associated faculty member, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by tenured faculty and nonprobationary professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate and prior approval of the college dean.
- **Reappointments.** For reappointments, the eligible faculty are tenured faculty and nonprobationary professional practice 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 tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1 above.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Section III.A.1-4 above.

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

6. Conflict of interest

- **Search Committee Conflict of Interest**

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

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

- **Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest**

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

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

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

7. Minimum composition

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

B. Promotion and tenure committee (PT)

The department has a Promotion and Tenure (PT) Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing promotion and tenure issues. The PT Committee consists of at least three tenure-track professors who are appointed by the department chair. The term of service of each member of the PT Committee is two years, with reappointment possible. When possible, the PT Committee should have members from faculty who can provide input/perspectives from both the MSE and WE programs.

When considering cases involving professional practice faculty, including professional practice faculty on a regional campus, the PT Committee may be augmented by two nonprobationary eligible professional practice faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor.

When considering cases involving research faculty, the PT Committee may be augmented by two nonprobationary research faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor.

The PT committee works with probationary tenure-track faculty to help prepare the dossier needed for the mandatory 4th year and 6th year reviews following the procedures detailed in Section VI.B.

The PT committee also provides feedback to non-probationary faculty interested in promotion and to probationary faculty interested in early promotion. If the candidate wants to be considered for a non-mandatory review and promotion, the procedures detailed below in Section VI.B should be followed.

The PT committee also works with professional practice and research faculty to prepare for mandatory reviews for reappointment and non-mandatory reviews for promotion according to the details provided below in Section VI.B. The committee provides feedback to the candidate and helps with preparation of the documentation for the dossier.

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.

When faculty members recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest, the total number of eligible faculty is reduced, possibly reducing the number required for a quorum. For example, assume a total of 30 eligible faculty members. Out of 30, three have to recuse themselves. The quorum is determined as $\frac{2}{3} * (30 - 3) = 18$.

D. Recommendation from the committee of the eligible faculty

It is the obligation of eligible faculty to participate in this process. All votes taken on personnel matters are by secret ballot. Only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes; they do not affect the number of eligible faculty or the number required for a quorum. Faculty members are strongly encouraged not to abstain from a vote on a personnel matter.

Participation in discussion and voting via a remote two-way electronic connection is allowed, with the understanding that the eligible faculty member has had the benefit of participating in the entire discussion related to the motion. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

A positive recommendation for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast is positive (i.e., the number of yes votes is greater than that of no votes).

For **Appointments** of candidates with partial FTEs in more than one department (jointly appointed faculty), the requirements for a positive recommendation are determined independently by the TIUs to which the candidate will be appointed. A positive recommendation is required from both TIUs in order to proceed with a joint appointment.

For **Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion** of jointly appointed faculty, a positive recommendation is determined by the TIU holding the primary (majority) appointment and defined by the APT documents of this TIU. For joint hires, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to their reappointment, promotion and/or tenure. A representative of the secondary TIU may be present in the discussion of the Committee of Eligible Faculty in the primary TIU as a resource in understanding aspects of a

candidate dossier that might not conform to the primary TIU model or that might reflect a hiring MOU concerning the candidate's responsibilities.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

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

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

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

1. Tenure-track faculty

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion (Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)).

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

- The candidate must possess an earned doctorate in a field of study relevant to materials science and engineering or welding engineering.
- The candidate's recommendation letters must establish the candidate as among the top of her or his peer group nationally.
- The candidate must demonstrate potential for excellence in teaching as determined in part by a record of teaching, the colloquium during the interview process, individual and small group discussions with faculty, staff, and students, and excellence in verbal and written communication.
- The candidate must demonstrate potential for excellence in scholarship as determined in part by an ability to formulate and complete a major body of research, and by the ability to clearly communicate the results and their significance in the form of peer-reviewed publications.
- The candidate's stated goals and career development plan must be consistent with the department mission.
- The candidate's performance during the interview and the candidate's references should indicate the potential that the candidate will help the department fulfill its mission.
- The candidate must exhibit a strong potential to advance through the faculty ranks.

Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service, unless there is a revised mandatory review year arising from exclusion of time (See Section V.B.2). Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the PT Committee (of the primary appointment TIU in the case of jointly appointed faculty) determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor with Tenure. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. To be appointed as an associate professor with tenure, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria:

- departmental criteria for appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor;
- departmental criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure (Section VI.A.1).

Professor with Tenure. Appointment offers at the rank of professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. An appointment as a professor involves tenure. To be appointed as a professor with tenure, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria:

- departmental criteria for appointment as an associate professor with tenure;
- departmental criteria for promotion to professor (Section VI.A.2).

Associate Professor without Tenure. A probationary appointment as Associate Professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four

years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e., terminal year of employment is offered.

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

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

2. Professional Practice faculty

As stated earlier, practice faculty in the MSE Department are referred to as Professional Practice Instructor, Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Professional Practice Associate Professor, or Professional Practice Professor. Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate.

Criteria and policies governing appointment of professional practice faculty must be consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Reappointment is based on the continued needs of the department.

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 at all ranks is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to professional practice faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

The activities of professional practice faculty must be consistent with the rationale for having professional practice faculty in the College of Engineering, which recognizes 2 paths: one (practice path) focused on bringing industry experience into the classroom, and the other (teaching path) on best practices in pedagogy. These activities may consist of, but are not limited to teaching of courses, laboratories and other practical experiences, creating and leading out-of-class learning experiences for students that are related to the practice of engineering. The expectation is that those on the Practice Path will be engaged with bridging the classroom and professional practice and contributing to courses or instructional situations involving professional skills. Those on the Teaching Path will engage in promulgating state of the art teaching in engineering classrooms. The scholarly emphasis of professional practice faculty is expected to be different from that of tenure-track and research faculty; professional practice faculty are expected to be more engaged in activities dealing with the practice of engineering and its impact on engineering education, while tenure-track and research faculty are expected to be more engaged in activities that advance the state of the art and science of engineering. The expectation for those professional practice faculty on the Teaching Path is usually that they be involved in the scholarship of teaching and learning. The venues appropriate for dissemination of such scholarly contributions therefore may be very different from those expected of tenure-track faculty. Scholarly and professional service activities of professional practice faculty are expected to emphasize interaction with constituencies beyond the research community. Additional details on the Duties and Responsibilities of professional practice faculty for each path are provided in the college's POA document.

Professional Practice Instructor. Appointment is normally made at the rank of professional practice instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree or has not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment. The department makes 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 professional practice assistant professor by the beginning of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract is not considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself continues.

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that a candidate for appointment as professional practice assistant professor has, at a minimum:

- Exemplary capability in the offeree's areas of specialization;
- Significant experience in the practice of the discipline;
- Demonstrated exceptional professional accomplishment;
- Potential to support student and program development in the offeree's areas of expertise

The offeree will have either (a) at least an earned master's degree, with a doctoral degree being preferred, or (b) appropriate professional accomplishments demonstrating expertise in their areas of specialization, a minimum of five years of experience in the workplace, and the required licensure/certification in their areas of specialization as the minimum requirements. Professional publications and actual teaching experience are desired but not required.

Professional Practice Associate Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that a candidate for appointment as a professional practice associate professor has met or exceeded the following minimum criteria:

- departmental criteria for appointment as professional practice assistant professor;
- departmental criteria for promotion to professional practice associate.

Professional Practice Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that a candidate for appointment as a professional practice professor has met or exceeded the following minimum criteria:

- departmental criteria for appointment as professional practice associate professor;
- departmental criteria for promotion to professional practice professor.

3. Professional Practice faculty – regional campus

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

4. Research faculty

Research faculty in the department will be referred to as Research Assistant, Associate, or Professor in Materials Science and Engineering. Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate.

Criteria and policies associated with research faculty appointments must be consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Research faculty members may participate with voting rights in matters of

governance and committee service at the department and the College level, except that they cannot participate or vote on promotion and tenure matters of tenure-track faculty or professional practice faculty (Faculty Rule [3335-7-37](#)).

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Research faculty are expected to focus their efforts on research. A research faculty member may, but is not required to, participate in limited educational activities in their area of expertise. Research faculty members are expected to contribute to the departmental research mission and are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected in high quality peer-reviewed publications and applications for successful competition of external funding of their research program.

The criteria for appointment, reappointment and non-reappointment, and for promotion for research faculty shall be established by this promotion and tenure document and approved by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty of the department and by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs. The criteria reflect the preponderance of responsibilities being in research activities. Excellence in research is a requirement, while a component associated with classroom teaching is not required.

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

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the departmental criteria for promotion to these ranks.

5. Associated faculty

Associated faculty are persons with adjunct, visiting, and lecturer titles. Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than 50% service to the university are also associated faculty members. Persons with tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty titles may not hold associated titles. Persons holding associated titles are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty. Associated faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of three consecutive years and, with the exception of visiting titles, may be renewed (Faculty Rule [3335-5-19](#)). Associated faculty do not have voting rights in the department.

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

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty of equivalent rank. The adjunct faculty rank is

determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are appropriate only for individuals who provide substantial service to the academic or research mission of the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Consideration for renewal must be done on an annual basis.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. Appointments as lecturer and senior lecturer are made only when a specific instructional need is identified. The person appointed must have the qualifications to teach the course(s) as demonstrated by at least an earned master's degree, with a doctoral degree being preferred or an equivalent experience for a lecturer or a senior lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have a terminal degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. The initial appointment for a lecturer or senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts cannot exceed three years. Appointments are generally made on an annual basis prior to the upcoming academic year. Exceptions to lecturer and senior lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college and OAA. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the eligible faculty. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1-49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

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

6. Emeritus faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured associate professors and professors, nonprobationary professional practice associate professors, and

nonprobationary professional practice professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

7. Joint Appointments

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

8. Courtesy appointments for faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student mentoring, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Consideration for renewal is done on an annual basis. The committee of eligible faculty for voting on Courtesy appointments is all tenure track faculty regardless of their ranks ([Faculty Rules 3335-5-19 B\(3\)](#)).

B. Procedures

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

In addition, see the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#):

- 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

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by 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](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. In the case of searches targeting jointly appointed faculty, the primary appointment TIU will be responsible for assembling the search committee, which must include at least one representative from the secondary TIU.

The [SHIFT](#) Framework serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent applicant pools, conduct consistent evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to advance the eminence of the institution.

- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency, fairness, and equity in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If the offer to the final candidate involves senior rank, the PT Committee in consultation with the search committee and department chair proposes a rank to the eligible faculty. The eligible faculty members then vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank in a recommending vote conducted in accordance with Section III.D. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The chair of the PT Committee reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first.

The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair. The chair prepares a draft letter of offer to a tenure-track faculty candidate, accompanied by the candidate’s curriculum vitae and appropriate letters attesting to the candidate’s qualifications, and submits these to the college of engineering administration for review and approval by the dean. Engineering administration will review the draft letter of offer for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The required documentation for appointments at senior rank and junior appointments with prior service credit can be found in the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

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

2. Professional Practice faculty on the Columbus Campus

Creation of a professional practice faculty position requires the prior approval of the dean. Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty.

Appointments at the rank of professional practice associate professor or professional practice professor require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. For such appointments, the dean may consult with the college promotion and tenure committee.

3. Professional Practice faculty – regional campus

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until the 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.

4. Research faculty

Creation of a research faculty position requires prior approval of the dean. Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. A national search may be waived with the approval of OAA if the candidate for the research faculty position already works at Ohio State as a research scientist. Likewise, letters and reference checks are not required. The department chair determines the details of the offer, including the length of the initial contract.

Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor require the approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. For such appointments, the dean may consult with the college PT Committee.

5. Transfer from tenure-track

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

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

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

6. TIU Transfer

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

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

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

7. Associated faculty

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

Reappointments are considered every year. For reappointment, the associated faculty member must submit an activity report, at the request of the chair, summarizing the duties performed and services provided during the previous appointment and requesting reappointment. This report should be submitted each year at the same time as all faculty Activity Reports. If the contributions are not substantial, the chair may recommend termination of the appointment. The recommendation to continue or terminate is voted upon by the eligible faculty of the department on an annual basis.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate.

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

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made annually based on their teaching assignments for the upcoming academic year. After the initial appointment and if the curricular needs of a department or school warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

8. Joint Appointments

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

9. Courtesy appointments for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty

Any faculty member may nominate a faculty member of another department within the university for a 0% courtesy appointment in MSE at the same rank, based on expected contributions to the mission of the department. The nominating faculty member must provide a written statement explaining the reasons for the appointment and the candidate must provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae. The department chair makes the appointment provided the candidate receives a majority of the votes of the eligible faculty members. As noted earlier, the committee of eligible faculty for voting on Adjunct and Courtesy appointments is all tenure track faculty regardless of their ranks. Please see Appendix A - Timetable for dates.

Faculty members with courtesy appointments must file a brief activity report each year, at the request of the chair, summarizing their contributions to the department for the previous year. This report should be submitted each year at the same time as all faculty activity reports. If the contributions are not substantial, the chair may recommend termination of the appointment. The recommendation to continue or terminate is subject to a majority vote of the faculty of the department with a 2/3 quorum requirement. Promotion in rank in the candidate's home department is recognized in the reappointment process. Please see Appendix A - Timetable for dates.

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 for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and

- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

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

In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the face-to-face meeting is to include the TIU Chairs and/or designees for all the TIUs to which the faculty member is appointed, while the written evaluation is to be prepared by the primary TIU Chair or designee and may be signed by all of the TIU Chairs or designees present at the meeting. Specific documentation requirements in the areas of teaching, research, creative work, scholarship and service are to be determined by the primary appointment TIU, with the understanding that joint appointments may require some agreed flexibility among the TIU Chairs to develop a consensus.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual performance and merit reviews of faculty members are based on expected performance in teaching, research, creative work and scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the departmental guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals 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 purpose of the review is to provide constructive feedback in writing to the faculty member about his/her performance, and an assessment of general progress toward his/her goals and contributions to the department mission. For jointly appointed faculty, annual reviews are to evaluate progress relative to the expectations of each TIU to which the faculty member is appointed. The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit. The annual review also provides the basis for merit salary increases. The annual review also provides the basis for a preliminary evaluation for PT considerations. Accordingly, meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The timetable for this process is summarized in Appendix A.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual performance and merit review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than March 1:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty and recommended for associate professors*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

The research expenditure report for individual faculty in the prior calendar year will be available in early February.

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

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

B. Probationary tenure-track faculty

The annual performance and merit review for probationary faculty members involves six other steps, in addition to the submission of the documentation described above:

- **By March 1.** The peer mentor to the probationary faculty submits to the PT Committee a summary of the meetings, peer assessment of teaching, or other activities related to the candidate.
- **By April 1.** The PT Committee will review the faculty member's annual activity report and provide a written report to the department chair with an evaluation of faculty member's strengths and weaknesses. If the committee and the department chair are not in substantial agreement, the department chair will meet with the PT Committee to achieve a consensus evaluation and recommendation.
- **Between March and April.** A meeting between the faculty member, a member of the PT Committee, and the department chair takes place to review the PT Committee's evaluations. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the Department Chairs or School Directors of all TIUs within the College to which the faculty member has been appointed must meet simultaneously with the faculty member in this meeting.
- **By May 15.** The department chair integrates the PT Committee's report with their evaluation and prepares a single written evaluation that is provided to the faculty member. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this letter should include input from all the appointed TIUs and be signed by Chairs of all the appointed TIUs. The evaluation explicitly identifies strengths and weaknesses, contains a clear statement of the areas of performance needing improvement, suggests ways and means to bring about improved performance, and includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.
- If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year. Within ten days after receiving the report, the faculty member may elect to provide a written response. Any response also becomes a permanent part of the file. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of

the college. A copy of the report is placed in the faculty member's Promotion and Tenure file.

- If the consensus evaluation of the faculty member's performance is below adequate and the likelihood of progressing toward tenure is deemed to be low, the case will be brought to a meeting of the eligible faculty for review and a vote on whether the faculty member should be reappointed according to the procedure outlined in the Fourth Year Reviews. Voting proceeds as described in Section III.D.
- If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth-year review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. The schedule is different such that the review at the department level occurs in the Jan.-Feb. timeframe.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the Department Chair of the secondary appointment TIU should be consulted as an additional source of evaluation in determining whether outside letters should be solicited.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written (secret) ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

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

The following describes the timetable of actions to be followed by the candidate, PT Committee, eligible voting faculty, department chair and College. It is noted that the dates below as well as those summarized in Table 3 in Appendix A are provided for general

information. The exact dates will follow those set forth by the college and can vary slightly from year to year.

By Jan 1. The candidate submits dossier to the Chair for review.

Mid Jan-early Feb. The eligible voting faculty meet to conduct 4th year review. PT committee presents the 4th year review dossier. The eligible voting faculty then vote on the case.

By Feb 5. The candidate is to be notified in writing of the completion of the Department Review and of the availability of the reports from the P&T Committee and the Chair. The candidate may provide the Chair with written comments on the review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification. This is an optional, not required, activity for the candidate.

By Feb 15. Candidate written comments on the Department Review submitted to the Chair.

By Feb 19. The Chair submits Promotion and Tenure Dossier to the Dean.

By Apr 19. Candidate is to be notified in writing of the completion of the College Level Review and of the availability of the reports of the College's P&T Advisory Committee (if appropriate) and the Dean. The candidate may provide the dean with written comments on the college review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of the completion of the review.

By Apr 29. Candidate written comments on the College Level Review submitted to the Dean.

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

No more than three years may be excluded from the probationary period for any reason, except in extraordinary circumstances. The faculty or department chair may advise a faculty member to apply to extend the probationary period, but may not require the individual to do so.

A faculty member may also apply for an extension of the tenure clock due to adverse events such as childbirth or adoption; personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the duties associated with being a successful faculty member; and being on less than full-time service for part or all of the probationary period. These requests are reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, which advises the department chair on the matter. Approval is based on the nature of the adverse event, the extent to which it was beyond the faculty member's control, and the faculty member's productivity before and after the period of the event. A negative recommendation by any of these parties terminates the review process.

C. Tenured faculty

In addition to the submission of the documentation described in Section V.A above, the annual performance and merit review for tenured faculty members involves the following steps:

- **By March 1.** Associate Professors only: The peer mentor to the associate professor submits to the PT Committee a summary of the meetings, peer assessment of teaching, or other activities related to the candidate;
- **By April 1.** Associate Professors only: PT Committee reviews the annual activity report and input from the peer mentor(s), resulting in an evaluation report from the committee to the department chair;
- **Between March and April.** Associate Professors and Professors: A meeting between the faculty member and the department chair to review the annual activity report. If appropriate, the meeting will include a member of the PT Committee to review the PT committee evaluation;
 - 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 department, 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.
- **By May 15.** Associate Professors and Professors: Review of the annual activity report and the PT Committee report (for associate professors only) by the department chair followed by a written evaluation prepared by the department chair. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these reviews should include assessments from all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed within the College. The evaluation will explicitly identify strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the areas of performance needing improvement, and suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance. Within ten days after receiving the report, the faculty member may elect to provide a written response. A copy of the report and written response is placed in 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. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs of any secondary appointment TIUs and is to be signed by Chairs of all the appointed TIUs.

In the penultimate contract year of a professional practice faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member continues. If the position does not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year is

the terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

If the position continues, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member is offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty except that external letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

E. Professional Practice faculty – regional campus

Annual review of the professional practice faculty member on a regional campus is first conducted on their regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

F. Research faculty

The annual review process for research probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs of any secondary appointment TIUs and is to be signed by Chairs of all the appointed TIUs.

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 does 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.

If the position continues, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member is offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

G. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty members are defined in Section IV.A.4. Compensated associated faculty will be reviewed on an annual basis. The associated faculty member will submit an annual activity report that documents the accomplishments and contributions for the previous calendar year.

For compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment, a review must take place before reappointment. The department chair or designee prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The recommendation by the department chair on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

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

H. Salary Recommendations

The department chair (of the primary appointment TIU in the case of jointly appointed faculty) recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. 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. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries.

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

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

The promotion and tenure process in MSE has an important role in achieving the department mission. Meeting the demands of the mission requires excellent performance by the departmental faculty. The criteria for promotion and tenure establish the required level of excellence. MSE will adhere to Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), which provides general context and guidelines for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews. Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility is 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 emphasis on its continuing activities, instances 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 terms, individuals are recommended for promotion in rank, or promotion in rank with tenure, based on demonstrated and documented contributions which enable the department to accomplish its mission. No individual is promoted or promoted and granted tenure without the full expectation that the individual continues to be a productive faculty member. No individual is promoted or promoted and granted tenure without the full expectation that the promotion serves to continue to improve the quality of the departmental faculty and programs.

Citizenship and collegiality are defined to include support of the department mission, participation in the governance of the department at faculty meetings and on department, college, and university committees, and a willingness to share in and respond in a timely fashion to the governance and administrative activities of the department. Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

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

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations. Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to ideas and opinions.

The measures of teaching, scholarship, and service are discussed as follows:

TEACHING	
The core of the departmental mission is education through teaching and mentoring. All department faculty must be involved in teaching and mentoring of students. There must be compelling evidence in the documentation of teaching and mentoring activities that the candidate is an effective teacher. Several criteria are considered.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met

<p>Candidates must exhibit a strong overall record in these four areas:</p>	<p>Candidates may be asked to submit (or collected on their behalf):</p>
<p>Quality of teaching is based on the faculty member's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • command of the subject matter; • ability to incorporate new developments, and growth in the field over time; • ability to appropriately select and organize educational material; • ability to integrate and relate the subject matter to other fields of knowledge; • ability to present the knowledge effectively in order to maximize learning; and • curriculum development in light of the needs of industry, society and the discipline; and • in the case of jointly appointed faculty, interdisciplinary courses across multiple departments, schools and colleges. 	<p>Evidence of quality is derived from curriculum development activities, anonymous student comments and evaluations, anonymous student exit interviews, anonymous surveys of alumni and employers, and peer reviews by fellow faculty members.</p>
<p>Effectiveness of teaching is judged based on the candidate's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the subject; • creativity, spirit, and enthusiasm which vitalize learning and teaching; • ability to arouse curiosity and creativity in students; and • ability to select appropriate teaching techniques reflecting the needs of the students. 	<p>Evidence of effectiveness is derived from student comments and evaluations, and peer reviews.</p>
<p>Relevance and impact of teaching is judged based on the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appropriateness of the material selected; • relationship of the material to fundamental understanding of the discipline; • relationship of the material to state-of-the-art professional practice; and • contributions to curriculum development in light of expressed industrial and societal needs. 	<p>Evidence of relevance and impact is obtained from student comments and evaluations, alumni surveys, industrial collaborators and peer reviews.</p>

<p>Excellence in mentoring is based on the candidate's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • skill and extent of participation in the general guidance and mentoring of both undergraduate and graduate students; and • ability to guide undergraduate and graduate students to the successful completion of degree requirements. • record of mentoring students to timely completion of their degrees; • significant involvement of undergraduates and graduate students in scholarly activity; • placement of graduate students who are highly regarded and successful in industry, government, or academic positions. 	<p>Evidence of excellence in mentoring is obtained from student comments and evaluations, student exit interviews, surveys of alumni and employers including surveys of former students and former students' employers, and from analysis of the faculty member's record of successful graduate mentoring.</p>
--	--

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH

There must be convincing evidence that the candidate is effectively engaged in scholarship. Collaborative, interdisciplinary, and individual efforts are all valued. Student participation in research is required. The scholarship of discovery, application and integration are all valued. Scholarship must be of high quality to be of value and it must have impact on the field. Impact may be on the intellectual direction of the academic field or on professional practice. As specific requirements will vary according to TIUs, care must be taken to consider impacts across multiple fields and appropriate flexibility must be exercised in the case of jointly appointed faculty.

Collaborative work is strongly encouraged, and indeed is essential to most types of inquiry. In this case, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. In the assessment of collaborative work that has led to research productivity, there shall be no evaluative bias against the number of collaborators or co-authors of publications, proposals, projects or other tangible products of the work. Because of the synergism that often results from collaborative work and because of the unique capabilities that individual contributors bring to a team, an assessment of contribution based solely on a linear fractionation of contribution among collaborators can be misleading and inappropriate, and a more holistic assessment of the candidate's contribution must be made.

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must exhibit a strong overall record in these three areas:	Candidates may be asked to submit (or collected on their behalf):
<p>Quality is judged based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • publication in respected archival peer-reviewed journals; • participation in respected colloquia, conferences, symposia and other scholarly forums; 	<p>Evidence of the quality of the scholarship is obtained primarily by analysis of the candidate's record and review by appropriate evaluators.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the presence of a coherent vision and an effective, well articulated and focused plan for scholarly activity. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this vision should include considerations of the research strategies of the TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed; • demonstration of sustained progress toward scholarly goals; and • the ability to attract and involve students in scholarly work. 	
<p>Effectiveness relates to the department mission that the results of scholarship must be disseminated. The effectiveness of dissemination is judged based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • substantial contributions to the body of knowledge; • a sustained level of productivity; and • utilization of all of the appropriate dissemination mechanisms to reach the intended audience in the profession and society. Journal papers, conference presentations, books and trade publications and patents are all important vehicles depending on the nature of the scholarship and should be balanced accordingly. 	<p>Evidence addressing the effectiveness of knowledge dissemination is primarily obtained from the candidate's record and the comments of evaluators.</p>
<p>Relevance and impact. Scholarship that is not relevant to the field or has no impact on the field is of little value in accomplishing the mission of the department. Relevance and impact may be relative to fundamental understanding of the field or one of its subdisciplines, or it may be directly related to professional practice. Relevance and impact are judged by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustained record of funding support for research and scholarly activities. There shall be no evaluative bias against any source of research funding if it has led to research productivity; • the generation of original and creative work that is used by others in the profession and society; • recognized leadership in the field; • patents, software, and new product or process developments; • active involvement on industry and government panels and policy forums; • active participation in cross-disciplinary scholarly activity. 	<p>Evidence of relevance and impact is obtained by the faculty member's record and evaluators' comments.</p>

SERVICE Faculty members are expected to engage in service activities that enhance the academic programs of the department, college and university and help us meet our mission as a land grant institution. For purposes of promotion and tenure, service includes, but is not limited to, service to the university, the profession, and public and private entities.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must exhibit a strong overall record in these four areas:	Candidates may be asked to submit (or collected on their behalf):
Quality is measured by leadership and organizing abilities and is demonstrated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • successful completion of assigned or elected tasks, and • significant involvement in committee work at any level (department, college, university, nationally, internationally). 	Evidence of quality service is obtained from analysis of the candidate's record, and evaluators' comments.
Effectiveness is demonstrated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • editorship of journals, books and other professional publications, • development of highly regarded short-courses and symposia, • a sustained record of consulting services to industry and society (consultation without compensation is highly valued), • a sustained record as a reviewer for professional publications, and • participation on proposal and program review panels for government agencies. 	Evidence of effective service is obtained from analysis of the candidate's record, evaluators' comments, and surveys of those served.
Relevance and impact are judged by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant professional society activities; • significance of administrative service to the department, college or university; • nature of service on advisory boards and panels for industry or government. 	Evidence of the relevance and impact of service is obtained from analysis of the candidate's record and evaluators' comments.
Excellence in mentoring with respect to service responsibilities is judged by the quality of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • career guidance given to students; • mentoring of new faculty with respect to career development and growth; • advice to members of industry and society in areas of professional responsibility and relevance. 	Evidence of excellence in mentoring is obtained from exit interviews with students, comments from faculty and staff, and evaluators' comments.

INTEGRATION. By necessity, the evaluation of faculty performance considers the dimensions of teaching, scholarship, and service. The ideal, however, is an individual who balances and integrates these activities into a synergistic whole. The integration of teaching, research and service to maximize the impact of the individual's activities on the department, college, university and society is highly valued.

1. Promotion to associate professor with tenure

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

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

When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, creative activities in outreach and engagement should be valued in addition to scholarly and teaching activities.

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 the faculty member, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the departmental academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in this document, is an essential qualification for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure. Insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the department and university that are dedicated to the discovery, application, and dissemination of knowledge. The recommendation to award tenure and promote to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has established, and gives the expectation of continuing, a program of high quality and effective teaching and scholarship relevant to the mission of the department.

The following table illustrates the minimum standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure judged using the criteria and evidence shown previously in the teaching, scholarship and service charts in VI.A. The performance judgment levels used in each category are **exceptional, excellent, good, adequate and poor**. The faculty member must exhibit adequate or better service. While teaching performance may not have fully evolved at this stage of the faculty member's career, it is essential that the scholarship record be exceptional or at least excellent to attain promotion. The basis for these judgments is described below. In making the evaluative judgments, the process will take into account how the faculty member stands in relation to his/her peers (i.e. at their early stages of an academic career) in the same field outside the university.

Table 1: Equivalent minimum performance expectations for promotion to associate professor with tenure

TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
Good	Excellent	Adequate

Teaching. The evaluation of teaching performance is based on the general criteria described in the previous section. To be judged excellent in teaching, the candidate's quality and effectiveness must be judged excellent, mentoring must be excellent and relevance must be at least good. To be judged good, the candidate must rate at least good on quality, effectiveness, mentoring and at least adequate on relevance and impact. A candidate who consistently rates poor on any of the teaching criteria will not be recommended for promotion or tenure.

Scholarship. The evaluation of scholarship is based on the general criteria described in the previous section. To be judged excellent in scholarship, the candidate's scholarly quality and effectiveness must be judged at least excellent. The scholarly work must also be relevant to the mission of the department and there must be evidence that the candidate's work is significant and beginning to have a substantial impact on the field.

To be judged good, the candidate's scholarly quality and effectiveness must be judged at least good. The scholarly work must also be relevant to the mission of the department and there must be evidence the candidate's work is significant and beginning to have a substantial impact on the field.

It is particularly important that the record provides evidence that the candidate's scholarly performance will continue to improve and the candidate has the potential for maintaining excellence in his/her chosen field. The faculty member's career development plan is particularly important in this regard as it is the record of work in progress.

Service. The department does not expect a junior faculty member to be involved in service activities at high levels. Moderate, but effective, involvement in departmental committee activities and some involvement in professional society activities at the national level is the minimum expected to be judged adequate. The service should demonstrate a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

2. Promotion to professor

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

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

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

The department does not expect all faculty members to follow the same path in achieving the level of excellence necessary for promotion to professor. Diversity of effort is required to meet our mission and is supported by the department. Table 2 summarizes the equivalencies of the minimum requirements with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service that the department considers in reaching judgments about promotion to professor. Each row in the table describes a different set of minimum performance levels that will result in a recommendation in favor of promotion. The performance judgment levels used in each column of Table 2 are exceptional, excellent, good, adequate and poor. Since convincing evidence of national and international

reputation is required for this promotion, a minimum evaluation of Excellent is required for scholarship.

Additionally, in evaluating a faculty member for promotion to professor, the department considers the following: (a) faculty members contribute to excellence differently across all evaluation dimensions, (b) faculty members have different distributions of assignments, (c) responsibilities of the TIU, College, and University are met by the collective contributions of the faculty. Faculty members who fail to meet the basic expectations in one or more dimensions in Table 2 acknowledge that their case for promotion is atypical and must present a compelling argument supported by sufficient evidence that balances the absence. Each report on the request by the faculty member to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor must address the degree to which the evaluation found the argument to be compelling.

Table 2: Equivalent minimum performance expectations for promotion to professor

TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
Exceptional	Excellent	Good
Excellent	Exceptional	Good
Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Good	Exceptional	Excellent

Teaching. Exceptional teaching corresponds to the situation in which all dimensions of the candidate's teaching – quality, effectiveness, impact and relevance, and mentoring – are clearly and consistently judged to be outstanding. Individuals meeting this standard are widely recognized as outstanding teachers. Only the very best teachers fall in this category.

Excellent teaching means that all dimensions of the candidate's teaching – quality, effectiveness, impact and relevance, and mentoring – are consistently judged excellent.

Good teaching corresponds to the situation in which teaching quality and effectiveness are judged high and the other dimensions are at least good.

Scholarship. Exceptional scholarship corresponds to the situation in which all dimensions of the candidate's scholarship – quality, effectiveness, impact and relevance, and mentoring – are clearly and consistently judged outstanding. Only the very best scholars fall in this category.

Excellent scholarship means that all dimensions are consistently judged to be of high quality. Scholars in this category are clearly leaders in their field and are making contributions that are internationally recognized.

Good scholarship corresponds to the situation in which the quality and effectiveness of scholarly activity is judged high and the other dimensions are at least good.

Service. Excellent service means that all dimensions of service are consistently judged to be of high quality. Candidates rated excellent will provide high quality leadership within the department, college and/or university. They will also be active nationally in the appropriate professional societies and will be involved in leadership roles either in professional societies or in policy-making panels and councils. Candidates rated excellent will also be active in service to industry through professional consultation or professional education and short courses.

Good service corresponds to significant and active involvement in the appropriate professional societies and active participation in department, college and university governance.

3. Promotion of professional practice faculty

All professional practice faculty are expected to:

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

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

Promotion to professional practice assistant professor from a Professional Practice Instructor. For promotion to Professional Practice Assistant Professor, a faculty member must complete their doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Promotion of professional practice faculty – regional campus

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

5. Promotion of research faculty

All research faculty are expected to:

- be engaged in the mentorship of students, particularly graduate students
- develop a record of scholarship
- contribute to service and thereby demonstrate a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

Classroom teaching is not required of research faculty (Faculty Rule [3335-7-32](#)). However, research faculty members are expected to engage in activities that develop the research capabilities of graduate students. Professional service activities are expected of research faculty and administrative service activities are expected to focus on tasks consistent with the candidate's scholarly expertise.

It is recognized that research faculty may emphasize research that applies and transitions technologies into practice as opposed to more fundamental investigations. The importance of maintaining full salary coverage is also recognized. The department takes these factors into account in evaluating research faculty candidates for promotion.

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

- mentorship of graduate students;
- substantial record of funded research;
- high quality scholarship;
- evidence of a growing national reputation;
- service that demonstrates a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

The candidate's scholarship must be judged as "excellent" and the service must be judged as "adequate" as described in Section VI.A.1.

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

Promotion to research professor. For promotion to Research Professor, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has and will continue to provide:

- successful mentorship of graduate students toward degree completion;
- a record of continuous funding;
- an extensive body of high-quality scholarship that has demonstrated impact in the field;
- evidence of a national and international reputation;
- service that demonstrates a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

The candidate's scholarship must be judged as "excellent" and the service must be judged as "adequate" as described in Section VI.A.1.

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

6. 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.5.

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

B. Procedures

The MSE departmental procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules [3335-6-04](#) for tenure-track faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for professional practice faculty, [3335-7-32](#) for research faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

1. Tenure-track faculty

a) Mandatory review

Mandatory review for probationary tenure-track faculty is for:

- an assistant professor in their final year of probation;
- an associate professor without tenure in their final year of probation.

The following describes the mandatory review procedure where the responsibilities of the candidate, PT Committee, procedures oversight designee, eligible faculty, and department chair are highlighted. It is noted that the review processes will be accomplished in the university's Faculty Information System (currently [Interfolio](#)). The dates below are provided for general information, and the exact dates will follow those set forth by the college and can vary slightly from year to year.

By January 15. Probationary faculty members are informed by the department chair of their mandatory status.

By April 1. All probationary faculty members must submit their dossiers to the PT Committee. The candidate is responsible for assembling the materials and following the most recent guidelines from the Office of Academic Affairs and the department. The PT Committee identifies a procedures oversight designee (POD) for each dossier, who reviews the dossier with the candidate.

By May 15. The candidate submits a revised dossier to the PT committee, which reviews the dossier and meets with the candidate if necessary to seek clarification and amplification. The candidate must also provide a copy of the APT document to be used for the review, if other than the department's current APT.

By June 1. The PT Committee provides a list of at least nine potential external evaluators to the candidate. The list is developed in consultation with the faculty and should consist of distinguished faculty (or non-academics who have similar research credentials and experience) who can provide an informed evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work. They should generally be at the rank of professor but must be at a rank above that of the candidate. In cases of jointly appointed faculty, additional evaluators may be suggested by the Department Chair of the secondary appointment TIU as appropriate. The list is provided to the candidate.

By June 15. The candidate provides to the PT committee the following:

- a final version of the dossier and up to five examples of scholarly work
- an External Evaluator Form for each proposed evaluator, indicating whether a proposed evaluator has a relationship (e.g., former collaborator) or conflict that may reduce the

objectivity of the evaluator. The candidate should detail the nature and timing of the relationship and reason for reduced objectivity.

- at the candidate's option, a request to remove up to two proposed evaluators from the PT external evaluator list, along with reasons for the request.
- at the candidate's option, the names of up to three additional proposed evaluators.

By June 30. The PT committee provides to the department chair the list of external evaluators and External Evaluation Forms generated by the candidate, any request by the candidate to remove proposed evaluators (if applicable), plus the list of external evaluators generated by the candidate (if any) and the evaluator forms. The department chair assesses the lists, including the requests for removal of evaluators by the candidate, and then seeks letters of evaluation from at least 9 external evaluators to ensure that at least five letters are received. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter will be requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write a letter, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. Letters of evaluation are also sought by the department chair from units within OSU in which the faculty member holds salaried joint appointments such as centers or other departments.

By September 15. After receiving all of the requested external letters of evaluation (at least five are required, with no more than half of them from the candidate's list of evaluators), the PT Committee evaluates the candidate's performance using the criteria described above in this document. The candidate is allowed to update their dossier. The promotion and tenure package is made available to eligible voting faculty to review.

September Faculty Meeting. A meeting of the eligible faculty is held at which the PT committee chair presents the dossier. It is the obligation of all eligible faculty to participate in the evaluation, discussion, and voting. An absentee ballot is not allowed, but a conference call resulting in a vote is permitted. The PT chair or the associate chair of the department records the number of votes required for a quorum and the number for, against, and abstaining from a motion in favor of recommending promotion and tenure. See Sections III C and D concerning a quorum and voting.

By October 1. The PT chair provides to the department chair a letter, for inclusion in the dossier, summarizing the results of the faculty evaluation including the numerical outcome of the faculty vote. The department chair independently evaluates each case and writes a draft letter of recommendation. The chair notifies the candidate that they may view the full dossier including all evaluation letters, and provide written comments on the departmental review for inclusion in the promotion and tenure package within 10 calendar days of being notified.

By October 10. The candidate provides, at their option, written comments on the departmental review for inclusion in the promotion and tenure package.

By October 23. The department chair submit the completed dossier to the Dean of the College of Engineering through the university's Faculty Information System. Prior to that, the committee and the department chair may provide written responses to the candidates' comments.

The departmental process with major milestones is summarized in the table presented in Appendix A.

b) Non-mandatory review

The non-mandatory review of a tenure-track faculty member is carried out in two stages; the preliminary review and the final review. The following describes the responsibilities of the candidate, PT Committee, procedures oversight designee, eligible faculty, and department chair.

By April 1. The PT Committee conducts a preliminary review of the annual activity reports and other supporting material such as the candidate's dossier and communicates the results of the review to the department chair.

April faculty meeting. The PT committee reports the results of the preliminary review of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to the eligible faculty. The committee does not take a position in presenting its analysis of the record. A decision is made by a vote of the eligible faculty whether to advance to the final review, which involves seeking external letters of evaluation. It is the obligation of the eligible faculty to participate in this process. The PT chair or associate chair records the number of votes required for a quorum and the number for, against, and abstaining from a motion in favor of seeking external letters of evaluation. See Sections III.C and D concerning a quorum and voting. If the vote is favorable, the PT committee identifies a procedures oversight designee (POD) for the candidate.

By April 30. The department chair communicates the outcome of the preliminary evaluation to the faculty member and, if that faculty member has received a favorable preliminary evaluation, invites the faculty member to prepare a dossier and meet with the designated POD to review the dossier.

May 15 and onward. From this point onward, the procedure is the same as for Mandatory Review and leads up to the final review. Please refer to Section VI.B.1.a.

The departmental process with major milestones is summarized in the table presented in Appendix A.

2. Professional practice faculty

The review procedure for promotion of professional practice faculty is similar to that for tenure-track faculty review except that a tenure decision is not involved. Any professional practice faculty member may request promotion. The PT committee may also recommend any professional practice faculty member for promotion or reappointment.

The following describes the process for the candidate, PT Committee, procedures oversight designee, eligible faculty, and department chair.

By March 1. The faculty informs the department chair of a request for promotion and the department chair informs the PT chair of the request.

By April 1. The PT Committee conducts a preliminary review of the annual activity reports and other supporting material such as the candidate's dossier and communicates the results of the review to the department chair.

April faculty meeting. The PT committee reports the results of the preliminary review of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to the eligible faculty. The

committee does not take a position in presenting its analysis of the record. A decision is made by a vote of the eligible faculty whether to seek external letters of evaluation. It is the obligation of the eligible faculty to participate in this process. The PT chair or associate chair records the number of votes required for a quorum and the number for, against, and abstaining from a motion in favor of seeking external letters of evaluation. See Sections III.C and D concerning a quorum and voting. If the vote is favorable, the PT committee identifies a procedures oversight designee (POD) for the candidate.

By April 30. The department chair communicates the outcome of the preliminary evaluation to the faculty member and, if that faculty member has received a favorable preliminary evaluation, invites the faculty member to prepare a dossier and meet with the designated POD to review the dossier.

By May 15 and onward. From this point onward, the procedure is the same as for Mandatory Review and leads up to the final review. Please refer to Section VI.B.1.a.

The departmental process with major milestones is summarized in the table presented in Appendix A.

3. Professional practice faculty – regional campus

Regional campus professional practice faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

4. Research faculty

The review procedure for the promotion or reappointment of research faculty is similar to that for tenure-track faculty review except that a tenure decision is not involved. Any research faculty member may request promotion or reappointment. The PT committee may also recommend any research faculty member for promotion or reappointment.

By March 1. The faculty informs the department chair of a request for promotion and the department chair informs the PT chair of the request.

By April 1. The PT Committee conducts a preliminary review of the annual activity reports and other supporting material such as the candidate's dossier and communicates the results of the review to the department chair.

April faculty meeting. The PT committee reports the results of the preliminary review of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to the eligible faculty. The committee does not take a position in presenting its analysis of the record. A decision is made by a vote of the eligible faculty whether to advance to the final review, which involves seeking external letters of evaluation. It is the obligation of the eligible faculty to participate in this process. The PT chair or associate chair records the number of votes required for a quorum and the number for, against, and abstaining from a motion in favor of seeking external letters of evaluation. See Sections III.C and D concerning a quorum and voting. If the vote is favorable, the PT committee identifies a procedures oversight designee (POD) for the candidate.

By April 30. The department chair communicates the outcome of the preliminary evaluation to the faculty member and, if that faculty member has received a favorable preliminary evaluation, invites the faculty member to prepare a dossier and meet with the designated POD to review the dossier.

By May 15 and onward. From this point onward, the procedure is the same as for Mandatory Review and leads up to the final review. Please refer to Section VI.B.1.a.

The departmental process with major milestones is summarized in the table presented in Appendix A.

5. Responsibilities of Tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty on the Columbus campus

a. Candidate

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

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete, accurate dossier that is fully consistent with the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) [dossier outline](#). Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs [Candidate Checklist](#) without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the OAA core dossier outline, including, but not limited to, those requirements highlighted on the checklist. While the PT committee makes a reasonable effort to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

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, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Documentation of teaching:

- Cumulative SSLE (formerly SEI) reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar for every class taught;
- A year-by-year summary of the SSLE (formerly SEI) reports (both quantitative and narrative components) prepared by a faculty member other than the candidate;

- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the departmental peer evaluation of teaching activities, including a narrative evaluation (See Section IX.B for more detail).
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research;
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers;
 - extension and continuing education instruction;
 - involvement in curriculum development;
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching;
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences;
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities;
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

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

Documentation of scholarship:

- Copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed;
- Documentation of grants and contracts received;
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted);
- Scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated

exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites;

- documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses;
- list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.

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, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Documentation of service:

- Service activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies;
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government;
 - clinical services;
 - administrative service to department;
 - administrative service to college;
 - administrative service to university and Student Life;
 - advising to student groups and organizations;
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department.
- Any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

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

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

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

candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

- **External Evaluations (see also External Evaluators below)**

Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the PT committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator does 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., permission from the Office of Academic Affairs may be requested to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, during the course of the review process.

b. PT committee

The responsibilities of the PT Committee (of the primary appointment TIU in the case of jointly appointed faculty) are to:

- Review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty;
- Provide an objective assessment of each candidate's progress, taking into consideration any MOU concerning a jointly hired candidate's expectations for performance;
- Ensure that the report on the candidate explains and addresses dissenting votes in the report, and also summarizes and addresses all eligible faculty comments;
- Transmit the completed dossier to the Engineering administration;
- Consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. An affirmative vote by those eligible to vote is required for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching, if applicable). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for 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.

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - Confirm a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for a candidate. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [in](#) OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook which include checking candidate's dossier to assure that it is prepared correctly using the most current dossier format, and monitoring the proceedings to assure that they are carried out in a highly professional manner.
 - Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. Recognizing that materials science and engineering is a vast field with specialized areas, external evaluations will be sought from faculty in programs that are nationally recognized in their field or subfields (see Section VI.B.4 below). In cases of jointly appointed faculty, additional evaluators may be suggested by the Department Chair of the secondary appointment TIU as appropriate.
 - Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The eligible faculty do not vote on these cases since the TIU of the joint appointee requires input sooner than the MSE PT Committee and faculty are able to conduct a formal review and vote.

c. Eligible faculty

The responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are to:

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

d. Department chair

The responsibilities of the department chair are to:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- Solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the PT Committee and reviewed by the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- Make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least one week before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- 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.
- Attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- Meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- Inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair

- of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- Forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- Receive the PT Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

C. Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

D. Procedures for Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty

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.

E. External Evaluators

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the Department of Materials Science and Engineering will ask for evaluations from faculty in programs that are nationally recognized in their field or subfields. Materials science and engineering is a vast field with specialized areas in various materials (e.g., metals, semiconductors, ceramics, polymers, and bio), properties and microstructure (e.g., electron microscopy, and corrosion), processing (e.g., welding, casting, forming, and additive manufacturing), and theory and computation. Because expertise in subareas of materials science and engineering are often found outside of many traditional departments of materials science and engineering, a specific list of institutions from which evaluators are drawn cannot be easily devised.

Accordingly, this department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators from the Big Ten Academic Alliance and the Association of American Universities. If a

candidate's field of research requires additional expertise outside of AAU, a request for review and approval will be made to the College of Engineering.

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

All promotion reviews for tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty require external evaluations. For professional practice and research faculty, the evaluators will be requested to review based on the respective criteria set forth in Sections IV.A.2 and IV.A.3, respectively, and summarized below.

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

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

- Is written by a person who is a non-Ohio-State employee, who is highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant), and who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Evaluations will be sought from distinguished individuals with qualifications generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The biographical information that the department provides on the cover sheet for external evaluations should provide a compelling and explicit justification of the appropriateness of each evaluator. For evaluation of tenure-track faculty, evaluations are solicited from professors or researchers who are eminent in their field in accordance to the guideline set forth previously. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. For evaluation of professional practice faculty or research faculty, evaluations may be solicited from individuals who are highly qualified to judge the candidate's performance.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A useful letter is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as

opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

The evaluators will be provided with a copy of the dossier and copies of documentation of three to five of the most significant contributions produced by the candidate. The candidate is responsible for selecting and providing this documentation to the chair of PT committee.

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

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

The department follows the suggested format from the Office of Academic Affairs for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for professional 42 practice faculty can be found in the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Teams directory.

For tenure-track and research candidates, the evaluators are asked to:

- Comment in some detail on the significance of the overall research program as well as on individual papers, including the scientific merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study;
- Compare the candidate to other researchers in this field at the same stage of career development;
- Not comment on whether the individual should be promoted at Ohio State or whether they would be promoted at their institution, as we must make that assessment based on their total record and according to our criteria and standards.
- Note that “Under the Ohio Public Records Act, all documents related to promotion and tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records subject to lawful requests to the university for viewing and/or copies. Candidates are offered the opportunity to review their dossiers after review at the departmental level is completed. In the unlikely event that anyone else requests access to your letter, we will be required to comply with that request.”
- Provide the evaluation on institutional letterhead with their signature.

Similar to tenure-track and research candidates, the evaluators of professional practice candidates will be provided with a copy of the core dossier that includes detailed information on teaching narrative, courses taught, teaching evaluation, and student advising. Additionally, the evaluators will be provided with copies of documentation of up to five of the most significant contributions produced by the candidate including those on engineering education and learning.

For professional practice candidates, the evaluators are asked to:

- Evaluate the expertise and ability of the candidate to share and transfer knowledge within their area of specialization. This might include outreach and engagement with industry, the educational community, and the broad community of practitioners as appropriate;
- Evaluate distinguished accomplishments in the area of teaching or instruction, including impact nationally or internationally;
- Evaluate the extent and quality of professional service to the department, college, and university.
- Compare the candidate to other professional practice faculty in this field at the same stage of career development.
- Not comment on whether the individual should be promoted at Ohio State or whether they would be promoted at their institution, as we must make that assessment based on their total record and according to our criteria and standards.
- Note that "The nature of a Professor of Professional Practice is to focus on teaching and instruction within the discipline rather than research."
- Note that "Under the Ohio Public Records Act, all documents related to promotion and tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records subject to lawful requests to the university for viewing and/or copies. Candidates are offered the opportunity to review their dossiers post review. In the unlikely event that anyone else requests access to your letter, we will be required to comply with that request."
- Provide the evaluation on institutional letterhead with their signature.

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

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

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

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

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

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

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

VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

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

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. Student evaluation of teaching

Use of the university's on-line Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE), including collection of open-ended narrative comments, is required in every course offered in this department. The instructor should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. If class time is allocated for student feedback, the faculty member should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted to complete the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback for future teaching. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

B. Peer mentorship and evaluation of teaching

Each faculty member who is eligible for promotion has a peer mentor, who together with the faculty member, participates as a member of the Peer Mentoring (PM) Committee. Tenure-Track Assistant or un-tenured Associate Professors are encouraged to utilize the Faculty Professional Development Program offered by the College. In this program, the mentoring committee will have 4 senior members (3 senior faculty and department chair):

- a) A senior faculty member in the department with research interests aligned with the new faculty member
- b) A senior faculty member outside the program (MSE or WE) or the department in a related field
- c) A senior faculty member outside the college or university

d) Department chair

For Peer Teaching Evaluation, Associate Chair and Teaching and Service Committee, in consultation with the faculty member and his/her mentor(s), will actively seek senior faculty to serve as the peer teaching evaluator(s). The activities of the Peer Mentorship Committee are to coordinate with the faculty member:

- Peer review of the teaching of probationary tenure-track and professional practice faculty at least once per year for the first two years of service, and then at least twice more before the commencement of a promotion review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction (e.g., undergraduate core, undergraduate technical elective, graduate core, graduate technical elective) to which the faculty member is assigned;
- Peer review of the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary professional practice associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of having at least two peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned;
- Review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professional practice professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review;
- Review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of associated faculty with teaching assignment such as lecturers.
- Review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- Review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer(s) should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment

tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the PT Committee chair, copied to the candidate. The report should include a narrative evaluation, not simply the evaluation form. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if they wish. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Appendix A. Timetable for the annual and promotion/tenure review process

Table 3: Review, promotion, and appointment timetable. Note that **dates are approximate and will vary from year to year**. For jointly appointed faculty, i.e., those with partial FTEs in more than one department, please refer to the previous sections for special considerations.

DATE	ACTIVITY
By Jan 1	Fourth year review candidates (FYR) submit dossier to department chair (DC) for review.
By Jan 15	DC informs probationary faculty if they are candidates for mandatory review (MR) .
Mid Jan-early Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of eligible voting faculty (EVF) to conduct 4th year review; • Promotion & Tenure Committee (PT) presents 4th year review dossier; • EVF vote on 4th year review cases.
By Feb 5	DC informs FYR of department review; FYR has 10 days to provide written comments.
By Feb 19	DC submits 4th year review package to the dean.
By Mar 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All faculty submit annual activity reports (AAR) and CVs; • DC provides PT with AARs for all faculty eligible for promotion/tenure.
By Apr 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT issues to DC preliminary reviews of all faculty eligible for promotion/tenure; • MR submit their dossiers to PT; • PT identifies a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for each MR.
mid-Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EVF meet to conduct preliminary review; • PT presents reviews of all faculty eligible for promotion/tenure/renewal to EVF; • EVF vote whether to move to the final review (seek letters of evaluation).
By Apr 19	FYR informed of results of college review; FYR has 10 days to provide written comments.
By Apr 30	DC informs all faculty who have been invited for the final review.
Apr-June	EVF meet to discuss and vote on appointments for lecturer(s) for upcoming academic year
By May 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All final review faculty (MR and invitees for final review) work with POD and submit revised dossier to PT; • FYR dossiers submitted to OAA.
By Jun 1	PT provides each final review faculty with a list of at least 9 potential external reviewers (PER) .
By Jun 15	Final review, faculty provide final version of dossier, external evaluator form for each PER, request to remove up to 2 PERs from the list, names and external evaluator forms for up to 3 additional PERs.
By Jun 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT provides DC with PER list and faculty requests to remove up to 2 PERs; • DC seeks external letters and input from joint departments, centers.
By Aug 1	Faculty submit nominations for adjunct and courtesy faculty requests to DC.

By Aug 15	DC completes annual evaluation meetings with all faculty; for probationary faculty, the meeting includes a PT member.
Aug Annual Retreat	Faculty vote on approval of adjunct and courtesy faculty appointments.
By Aug 30	DC issues written annual evaluations to all faculty; faculty provides written response to DC within 10 days.
By Sep 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT evaluates performance of all final review faculty; • Final review faculty update dossier; • Final review dossier made available to all eligible voting faculty.
mid-late Sep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of eligible voting faculty (EVF) to conduct final review; • PT presents final review dossier with external letters; • Eligible faculty vote on whether to recommend promotion/tenure.
By Oct 1	PT provides DC with written results of discussion and vote to recommend promotion/tenure. DC finalizes letter of recommendation on promotion/tenure. DC notifies candidate of availability to view the full dossier, including all evaluation letters, and the option to provide written responses to include in the package.
By Oct 10	Candidate to provide to DC any written responses to DC and PT evaluation letters, for inclusion in the package (This is an optional, not required, activity for the candidate).
By Oct 23	DC delivers PT packages to college.
Mid-Jan.	Candidate notified of the completion of the COE level review.
Late-Jan.	Candidate written comments on the COE level review due to the dean.
Early-Feb.	PT dossiers submitted to OAA.
Mar.	OAA review completed.
Early Jun.	Final approval of PT recommendations by Board of Trustees (BOT).
