

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

Approved by the Faculty: 15 March 2021

Amended June 2022 to reflect changes in College of Engineering APT
Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: July 11, 2022

Table of Contents

I	Preamble	5
II	Departmental Mission	5
III	Definitions.....	6
III.A	Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
III.A.1	Tenure-track Faculty	6
III.A.2	Faculty of Practice	6
III.A.3	Research Faculty	7
III.A.4	Associated Faculty: Adjunct professor appointments (any rank)	8
III.A.5	Associated Faculty: Lecturers and Senior Lecturers	8
III.A.6	Conflict of Interest	8
III.A.7	Minimum Composition	8
III.B	Promotion and Tenure Committee	9
III.C	Quorum	9
III.D	Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	9
III.D.1	Appointment	9
III.D.2	Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal	9
IV	Appointments	10
IV.A	Criteria	10
IV.A.1	Tenure-track Faculty	10
IV.A.2	Joint Appointments	11
IV.A.3	Faculty of Practice	11
IV.A.4	Research Faculty	12
IV.A.5	Associated Faculty	13
IV.A.6	Regional Campus Faculty	15
IV.A.7	Emeritus Faculty	15
IV.A.8	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	15
IV.B	Procedures	16
IV.B.1	Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	16
IV.B.2	Faculty of Practice	18
IV.B.3	Research Faculty	18
IV.B.4	Transfer from the Tenure Track	18
IV.B.5	Associated Faculty	18

IV.B.6	Regional Campus Faculty	19
IV.B.7	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	19
V	Annual Performance and Merit Review	19
V.A	Documentation	20
V.B	Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	21
V.B.1	Fourth Year Review	21
V.B.2	Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	22
V.C	Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	22
V.D	Faculty of Practice on the Columbus Campus	23
V.E	Research Faculty on Columbus Campus	24
V.F	Associated Faculty on Columbus Campus	24
V.G	Regional Campus Faculty	25
V.H	Salary Recommendations	25
VI	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	26
VI.A	Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion	26
VI.A.1	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	26
VI.A.2	Promotion to Professor	27
VI.A.3	Joint Appointments	27
VI.A.4	Promotion of Faculty of Practice	28
VI.A.5	Promotion of Research Faculty	29
VI.A.6	Associated Faculty	30
VI.A.7	Regional Campus Faculty	31
VI.B	Procedures	31
VI.B.1	Tenure-Track Faculty, Faculty of Practice, and Research Faculty	31
VI.B.2	Nonmandatory Reviews for Promotion and Tenure or for Promotion	42
VI.B.3	Promotion and Tenure Committee Voting Procedures	43
VI.B.4	Summary of Normal Promotion and Tenure Schedules	43
VI.B.5	Procedures for Associated Faculty	43
VI.B.6	Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	43
VI.B.7	External Evaluations	44
VII	Appeals	45
VIII	Seventh Year Review	45
IX	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation	45
IX.A	Student Evaluation of Teaching	46

IX.B Peer Evaluation of Teaching 46
X Appendix: Publication Strategies for CSE Faculty..... 46

I Preamble

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

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

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

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

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

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

II Departmental Mission

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

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

3 4 **III Definitions**

5 **III.A Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

6
7 The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, contract renewal, promotion, or
8 promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the department.

9
10 The department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice
11 president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for
12 appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

13 14 **III.A.1 Tenure-track Faculty**

15 16 **Initial Appointment Reviews**

17
18 During on-duty terms, initial appointment recommendations to the chair are determined by the standing
19 faculty search committee as representatives of the eligible faculty. As departmental committees do not
20 operate during off-duty terms, for appointments considered in off-duty terms, a special meeting of the
21 tenure-track faculty will be called to make the initial appointment recommendation to the chair.

22
23 For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant
24 professor, recommendations are made to the chair from the appropriate committee as in the first
25 paragraph.

26
27 For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate
28 professor or professor), separate votes for appointment and rank are conducted. Appointment
29 recommendations are made in accordance with the first paragraph. The eligible faculty for the rank vote
30 consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

31 32 **Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

33
34 For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors and the tenure reviews of
35 probationary associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and
36 professors.

37
38 For the promotion reviews of associate professors and the tenure reviews of probationary professors, the
39 eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

40 41 **III.A.2 Faculty of Practice**

42 43 **Initial Appointment Reviews**

44
45 During on-duty terms, initial appointment recommendations to the chair are determined by the standing
46 faculty search committee as representatives of the eligible faculty. As departmental committees do not
47 operate during off-duty terms, for appointments considered in off-duty terms, a special meeting of the
48 tenure-track faculty and faculty of practice will be called to make the initial appointment recommendation
49 to the chair.

1 For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant
2 professor of practice, recommendations are made to the chair from the appropriate committee as in the
3 first paragraph.

4
5 For appointment (hiring) at senior rank (associate professor of practice or professor of practice), separate
6 votes for appointment and rank are conducted. Appointment recommendations are made in accordance
7 with the first paragraph. The eligible faculty for the rank vote consists of all tenured faculty of equal or
8 higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary faculty of practice of equal or higher
9 rank than the position requested.

10 **Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews**

11
12
13 For the first reappointment, first contract renewal, and any promotion reviews of assistant professors of
14 practice, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all
15 nonprobationary associate professors of practice, and all nonprobationary professors of practice.

16
17 For the first reappointment, first contract renewal, and any promotion reviews of associate professors of
18 practice, and the reappointment and contract renewal reviews of professors of practice, the eligible faculty
19 consists of all tenured professors, and all nonprobationary professors of practice.

20
21 For the subsequent reappointment and contract renewal of faculty of practice, an ad hoc subcommittee of
22 the appropriate eligible faculty will advise the chair on reappointment.

23 **III.A.3 Research Faculty**

24 **Initial Appointment Reviews**

25
26
27
28 During on-duty terms, initial appointment recommendations to the chair are determined by the standing
29 faculty search committee as representatives of the eligible faculty. As departmental committees do not
30 operate during off-duty terms, for appointments considered in off-duty terms, a special meeting of the
31 tenure-track faculty and research faculty will be called to make the initial appointment recommendation to
32 the chair.

33
34 For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research
35 assistant professor, recommendations are made to the chair from the appropriate committee as in the first
36 paragraph.

37
38 For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (research
39 associate professor or research professor), separate votes for appointment and rank are conducted.
40 Appointment recommendations are made in accordance with the first paragraph. The eligible faculty for
41 the rank vote consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, all
42 nonprobationary faculty of practice of equal or higher rank, and all nonprobationary research faculty of
43 equal or higher rank than the position requested.

44 **Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews**

45
46
47 For the first reappointment, first contract renewal, and any promotion reviews of research assistant
48 professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all
49 nonprobationary research associate professors and professors.

1 For the first reappointment, first contract renewal, and any promotion reviews of research associate
2 professors and the reappointment and contract renewal reviews of research professors, the eligible faculty
3 consists of all tenured professors, and all nonprobationary research professors.
4

5 For the subsequent reappointment and contract renewal of research faculty, an ad hoc subcommittee of
6 the appropriate eligible faculty will advise the chair on reappointment.
7

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

9 **Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal**

10 Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), reappointment, and contract
11 renewal of associated faculty members with adjunct titles are decided by the department chair in
12 consultation with the faculty search committee.
13
14

15 Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty of equal or
16 higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.
17
18

19 **Promotion Reviews**

20 Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles.
21
22

23 For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same
24 as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1 above.
25

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

27 **Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal**

28 Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), reappointment, and contract
29 renewal of lecturers and senior lecturers are decided by the department chair in consultation with the
30 associate chair(s).
31
32

33 **Promotion Reviews**

34 The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the
35 associate chair(s).
36
37

38 **III.A.6 Conflict of Interest**

39 A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable
40 close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some
41 way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation
42 advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's
43 work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50%
44 of the candidate's published work will be expected to withdraw from an appointment or promotion review
45 of that candidate.
46
47

48 **III.A.7 Minimum Composition**

1 In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a
2 review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another
3 tenure-initiating unit within the college.
4

5 **III.B Promotion and Tenure Committee**

6
7 The eligible faculty for any case constitute the Promotion and Tenure committee for the case. Ad hoc
8 subcommittees will be assigned as Liaison subcommittees for each case (see Section VI.B.1 for
9 procedural details).
10

11 **III.C Quorum**

12
13 The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty
14 not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless
15 they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are
16 eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from
17 the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-
18 campus assignment.
19

20 Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when
21 determining quorum.
22

23 **III.D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

24
25 In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes.
26 Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review
27 process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Faculty who did not attend the entire
28 discussion of a case are not permitted to vote on that case.
29

30 Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via
31 remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.
32

33 **III.D.1 Appointment**

34
35 A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty or search committee for appointment is secured
36 when at least two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.
37

38 In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment
39 TIU prior to his or her appointment.
40

41 **III.D.2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal**

42
43 A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion,
44 and contract renewal is secured when at least two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.
45

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

IV Appointments

IV.A Criteria

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

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

IV.A.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#), [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#), and [OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) Volume 1, Chapter 1, Section 2.3.1.1.

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

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

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

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

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

- 3 • demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- 4 • a record of high-quality research in the computing field;
- 5 • a potential for excellence in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- 6 • a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-
7 the-art in computing;
- 8 • a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- 9 • a potential for making contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field of computing;
- 10 • an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a
11 professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- 12 • strong potential to achieve tenure and advance through the tenure-track faculty ranks.

14 **Associate Professor and Professor.**

15
16 Appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor will be made consistent with the criteria for
17 promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Sections VI.A.1 and VI.A.2, respectively. Generally, an initial
18 appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more
19 sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on
20 potential or on number of years of experience. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure.
21 Probationary appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor without tenure may be made in
22 accordance with [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03-B-1](#). A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate
23 only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or
24 has taught only in a foreign country. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor,
25 with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of
26 Academic Affairs.

27
28 Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

30 **IV.A.2 Joint Appointments**

31
32 In the case of candidates being considered for a joint appointment with partial FTE in one or more
33 additional departments (jointly appointed faculty), the requirements for a positive recommendation must
34 be determined independently by all TIUs to which the candidate will be appointed. In addition to
35 procedures and criteria outlined in this document regarding joint appointments, any additional
36 requirements stipulated in the College APT document must be followed.

37
38 For all joint appointments with a non-zero FTE in CSE, an MOU must be created at appointment
39 outlining the expectations from all pertinent units, particularly in regards to promotion (and tenure if
40 appropriate).

42 **IV.A.3 Faculty of Practice**

43
44 Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-05](#), [Faculty Rule 3335-7-07](#).

45
46 Faculty of Practice in the Department will develop, enhance, and teach courses and programs generally
47 emphasizing professional practice issues and incorporating practical design experiences. They also may
48 develop and teach courses designed for industry professionals seeking to advance their understanding of

1 computing and especially its practice. In addition, faculty of practice may engage in the development and
2 delivery of technology transfer and consultative services for industry and for other academic units at
3 OSU, primarily in the context of mentoring students in such activities. They will participate in faculty
4 governance to the extent outlined in Section III.A.2 and in the Department's Pattern of Administration
5 document. Faculty of practice will be referred to as "Assistant Professor of Practice", "Associate
6 Professor of Practice", or "Professor of Practice" in Computer Science and Engineering.
7

8 **Assistant Professor of Practice**

9

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

- 13 • demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- 14 • a record of successful professional experience and productive activities in previous employment
15 involving professional practice, indicating advanced knowledge and capability in the appointee's area of
16 specialization within computing;
- 17 • a history of involvement in professional activities appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization,
18 and documented professional accomplishment in these activities;
- 19 • a potential for excellence in teaching courses involving professional practice in computing, both in
20 the classroom and in student advising;
- 21 • a potential for excellence in outreach and engagement, associated typically with leadership in
22 academic program development involving professional practice in computing and related state-of-the-
23 practice activities that directly engage students;
- 24 • a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- 25 • a potential for making contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field of computing;
- 26 • an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a
27 professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- 28 • strong potential to advance through the faculty of practice ranks.
29

30 **Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice**

31

32 Appointments at the rank of associate professor of practice or professor of practice will be made generally
33 consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section VI.A.4, but with the
34 recognition that some of the criteria may not have been possible to meet in the case of new hires.
35 Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher
36 and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based
37 primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.
38

39 The initial contract for all practice faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract
40 is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Subsequent contracts are non-probationary.
41

42 Second and subsequent contracts for practice assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at
43 least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for practice professors
44 must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to practice
45 faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.
46

47 **IV.A.4 Research Faculty**

48

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

2
3 Research faculty members in the Department are expected to focus their efforts on research. They will be
4 expected to advise graduate students, and may participate in limited educational activities such as
5 developing and teaching courses related to their research, but are not expected and will not be required to
6 do the latter. They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in Section III.A.3 and in
7 the Department's Pattern of Administration document. Research faculty members will be referred to as
8 "Research Assistant Professor", "Research Associate Professor", or "Research Professor" in Computer
9 Science and Engineering.

10 **Research Assistant Professor**

11
12
13 An appointee to the rank of research assistant professor will have strong potential to help the Department
14 achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing in the manner described in
15 the previous paragraph. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- 16 • demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- 17 • a record of high-quality research in the computing field;
- 18 • a potential for excellence in advising of graduate students;
- 19 • a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-
- 20 the-art in computing;
- 21 • a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- 22 • a potential for making contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field of computing;
- 23 • an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a
- 24 professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- 25 • strong potential to advance through the research faculty ranks.

26 27 **Research Associate Professor, Research Professor**

28
29 Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor will be made generally
30 consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section VI.A.5, but with the
31 recognition that some of the criteria may not have been possible to meet in the case of new hires.
32 Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher
33 and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based
34 primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

35
36 Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year appointments. The initial appointment is
37 probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Subsequent contracts are non-probationary.
38 Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will
39 be offered, regardless of performance.

40 41 **IV.A.5 Associated Faculty**

42
43 Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#).

44
45 Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a
46 semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-
47 term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

1 **Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.** Adjunct appointments
2 may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give
3 academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees,
4 for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the
5 criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but
6 not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.
7

8 **Lecturer.** An appointee to a lecturer position will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its
9 mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing to teaching. In addition, an appointee
10 to a lecturer position normally will have an advanced degree in computing or a related field, or equivalent
11 experience. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- 12 • the ability to communicate clearly in written and verbal form as demonstrated through application
- 13 materials and interviews;
- 14 • a potential to deliver high quality teaching demonstrated through previous teaching experiences and
- 15 interviews;
- 16 • a potential for making contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field of computing; and
- 17 • an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a
- 18 professional, ethical, and constructive fashion.
- 19
- 20

21 Exceptions to lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college
22 and OAA. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the
23 criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed
24 one year.
25

26 **Senior Lecturer.** An appointee to a senior lecturer position will have strong potential to help the
27 Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing to teaching. In
28 addition, an appointee to a senior lecturer position will have (1) an earned doctorate in the computing
29 field, or in a closely-allied discipline appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization, (2) a master's
30 degree and at least 5 years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality teaching, or (3)
31 extensive experience (20+ years) in the computing field. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- 32 • the ability to communicate clearly in written and verbal form as demonstrated through application
- 33 materials and interviews;
- 34 • a potential to deliver high quality teaching demonstrated through previous teaching experiences and
- 35 interviews;
- 36 • a potential for making contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field of computing; and
- 37 • an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a
- 38 professional, ethical, and constructive fashion.
- 39
- 40

41 Exceptions to lecturer/senior lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval
42 of the college and OAA. Lecturers/Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure. The initial appointment for
43 a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year.
44

45 **Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor.**

46 Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on
47 leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position.
48 The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for
49

1 appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion.
2 Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

3 4 **IV.A.6 Regional Campus Faculty**

5
6 Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#).

7
8 In recognition of the differing mission of the regional campuses, for regional campus tenure-track faculty
9 and faculty of practice appointments, relatively less weight will be placed on the quantity of an
10 applicant's scholarship/outreach and engagement compared to Columbus campus appointments and more
11 emphasis will be placed on teaching potential or excellence. The quality of scholarship/outreach and
12 engagement of regional campus appointments is expected to be comparable to that of Columbus
13 appointments.

14
15 Research faculty appointed at Regional Campuses must meet the same expectations for appointment and
16 promotion as research faculty on Columbus campus.

17
18 The length of probationary period for regional campus faculty is the same as that for Columbus faculty.

19 20 **IV.A.7 Emeritus Faculty**

21
22 Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the
23 university as described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-36](#). Full-time tenure track, practice, research, or associated
24 faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or
25 more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

26
27 Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for
28 associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The
29 Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured and nonprobationary practice associate professors and professors)
30 will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The chair will decide
31 upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status
32 has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law,
33 rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure
34 according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

35
36 See the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of
37 perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available.

38
39 Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure
40 matters.

41 42 **IV.A.8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

43
44 Courtesy appointments are no-salary joint appointments for Ohio State faculty from other tenure-initiating
45 units. Candidates for such appointments will have significant experience in computing, and will be ready
46 and able to engage effectively with the Department's faculty in activities that help the Department achieve
47 its mission and enhance its quality and reputation. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's
48 current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

1 **IV.B Procedures**

2
3 See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for
4 information on the following topics:

- 5
6
- 7 • recruitment of tenure-track, practice, research, and associated faculty
 - 8 • appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
 - 9 • hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
 - 10 • appointment of foreign nationals
 - 11 • letters of offer

12 For all Tenure Track, Faculty of Practice, and Research Faculty appointments on the Columbus campus, a
13 Faculty Search Committee, appointed by the Department Chair, shall be responsible for conducting
14 searches for new faculty members, in compliance with university policies. Prior to any search, members
15 of the Faculty Search Committee must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the
16 college with resources from the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, such as that
17 available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#), is also required of all search
18 committee members prior to any search.

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

20
21
22 A national search will be conducted for each tenure-track faculty position unless the college and the
23 Office of Academic Affairs approve an exception to this policy in advance. Search procedures must
24 entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and](#)
25 [Selection](#).

26
27 Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

28
29 The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This
30 approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of
31 expertise.

32
33 The department chair annually appoints a standing search committee consisting of three or more faculty
34 who coordinate the activity across all active searches. For any search, the search committee will appoint
35 subcommittees of three or more faculty that reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search.
36 These faculty need not be members of the standing faculty search committee.

37
38 The search committee:

- 39
- 40 • Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that
41 vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
 - 42
 - 43 • Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through
44 the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's
45 approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the
46 goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the
47 announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the
48 receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to
49 allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
 - 50

- 1 • Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of
2 nominations and applications.
3
- 4 • The subcommittee for a search screens applications and letters of recommendation and
5 presents to the faculty search committee a summary of those applicants (usually three to five)
6 judged worthy of interview. If the search committee agrees with this judgment, virtual or on-
7 campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department
8 office. If the search committee does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the
9 faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other
10 applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).
11

12 Virtual or on-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty
13 groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or
14 designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their
15 scholarship, and may teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation.
16 All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format and relevant
17 accommodations for disability/impairment should be provided.
18

19 Following completion of virtual/on-campus interviews, the faculty search committee meets to discuss
20 perceptions and preferences of the eligible faculty, and to vote on each candidate. The faculty search
21 committee reports a recommendation on each candidate to the department chair.
22

23 If the offer involves senior rank, the faculty search committee forwards a request for rank evaluation to
24 the Promotion and Tenure committee chair. The eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of
25 the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the
26 appropriateness of such credit. Based on the vote of the eligible faculty, the Promotion and Tenure
27 committee chair reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the
28 appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of
29 Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior
30 approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.
31

32 In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the
33 department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including
34 compensation, are determined by the department chair.
35

36 The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for
37 permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. The
38 university will not grant tenure unless an individual is (1) a U.S. citizen or national; (2) permanent
39 resident (“green card” holder); (3) asylee or refugee; or (4) an individual otherwise described as a
40 “protected individual” pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b). The department will
41 therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in seeking residency status for the
42 appointee promptly and diligently.
43

44 In case of searches that target jointly appointed faculty with CSE as the primary appointment TIU, the
45 CSE faculty search committee must include at least one representative from all proposed TIUs. With such
46 searches, the seminar presentation must be arranged by CSE, with attendance by relevant faculty from all
47 proposed TIUs. Each proposed TIU must make a recommendation to the CSE Department chair on each
48 interviewed candidate.
49

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

4 5 **IV.B.2 Faculty of Practice**

6
7 Searches for faculty of practice generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the
8 exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on professional
9 practice rather than scholarship, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college
10 dean.

11
12 No appointment or reappointment to a faculty of practice position in CSE will be made if it would result
13 in the number of FTE faculty of practice exceeding 20% of the total tenure-track, practice, and research
14 faculty in the Department.

15 16 **IV.B.3 Research Faculty**

17
18 Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception
19 that during the virtual or on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class, and exceptions
20 to a national search require approval only by the college dean.

21
22 No appointment or reappointment to a research faculty position in CSE will be made if it would result in
23 the number of FTE research faculty in the Department exceeding 20% of the number of FTE tenure-track
24 faculty in the Department.

25 26 **IV.B.4 Transfer from the Tenure Track**

27
28 Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a faculty of practice or research appointment if appropriate
29 circumstances exist. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by
30 the chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

31
32 The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the
33 individual's career goals and activities have changed.

34
35 Transfers from a faculty of practice appointment and from a research appointment to the tenure track are
36 not permitted. Faculty of practice and research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and
37 compete in regular national searches for such positions.

38 39 **IV.B.5 Associated Faculty**

40
41 An appointment or reappointment to an associated faculty position will be made by the Department chair,
42 following consultation with appropriate faculty who are familiar with the candidate and the duties of the
43 position and (in the case of reappointment) have interacted with the candidate in performance of the
44 candidate's assigned duties. For an associated appointment that involves an adjunct or visiting faculty
45 title, input also will be sought from the Faculty Search Committee (see the Department's Pattern of
46 Administration document). Compensated appointment or reappointment will be for a period not to
47 exceed three years FTE.

48
49 Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three
50 years.

51

1 Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester.
2 After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year
3 appointment may be offered.
4

5 All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to
6 be continued.
7

8 **IV.B.6 Regional Campus Faculty** 9

10 The hiring of regional campus faculty is initiated by the dean of the regional campus, since funding for
11 such positions comes from these campuses. The regional campus faculty have the primary responsibility
12 for determining the position description for a regional campus faculty search, but the regional campus
13 should consult with and reach agreement on the description with the Department chair. The search
14 committee for a regional campus position will include at least one member of the CSE Faculty Search
15 Committee. Part of the interview process will be conducted on the Columbus campus. Candidates are
16 interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, and regional campus search
17 committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this
18 document. The CSE Faculty Search Committee will consider recommendations of the regional campus
19 faculty search committee and make a recommendation to the Department chair. A decision to make an
20 offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached,
21 negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department
22 chair and the regional campus dean.
23

24 Searches for regional campus faculty of practice and research faculty are the same as those described
25 above for tenure-track faculty.
26

27 A regional campus tenure-track, of practice, or research faculty appointment will be made jointly by the
28 Department chair and the dean of the regional campus, following approval by the dean of the College of
29 Engineering. An offer at the associate professor or professor rank, with or without tenure, or an offer of
30 prior service credit, will require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. An offer to a foreign
31 national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.
32

33 Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the
34 dean/director, department chair, program coordinators, and other relevant faculty members.
35

36 **IV.B.7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty** 37

38 A candidate for a courtesy appointment will be nominated initially by a tenure-track, practice, or research
39 faculty member in the Department. The Department chair, after consultation with the Faculty Search
40 Committee and tenure-track faculty, will invite the candidate to make a public presentation of his/her
41 research that highlights past and potential interactions with the Department's faculty.
42

43 A courtesy appointment or a courtesy reappointment will be made by the Department chair, following
44 consultation with the Faculty Search Committee and tenure-track, practice and research faculty.
45 Appointment or reappointment will be for a period not to exceed three years.
46

47 **V Annual Performance and Merit Review** 48

49 The department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review as set forth in the
50 [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a

1 scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. According to the
2 policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- 3
- 4 • Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and
5 through the establishment of professional development plans;
 - 6 • Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the
7 foreseeable future; and
 - 8 • Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary
9 increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor
10 performance, the need for remedial steps.
 - 11 • The annual performance and merit review of every faculty member is based on expected
12 performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on
13 faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the
14 individual; on progress toward promotion where relevant; and on activities that enhance the
15 inclusive culture of the college and department, in keeping with the values of the university and
16 college.

17
18 Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same
19 criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

20
21 The chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual performance and
22 merit review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary
23 personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.
24

25 **V.A Documentation**

26
27 Each faculty member, even one on leave, will be expected to prepare an **Annual Activity Report**
28 detailing his/her professional activity over the past year. This report normally will be due in March. The
29 Department chair will annually provide at least two weeks advance notice to all faculty of the exact due
30 date of this material.

31
32 Faculty members must submit the following documents as part of the review:

- 33 • Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3
34 (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and
35 accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- 36 • updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
37

38
39 Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for
40 consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this
41 document.
42

43 Information from the Annual Activity Report will be used in annual evaluations as noted below, and in
44 determining salary increases (see Section V.H). Supplementary information may be offered by the
45 faculty member, or may be requested by the Department chair. The Annual Activity Report and any other
46 materials submitted by the faculty member as part of the annual review will be included in that faculty
47 member's personnel file.
48

1 **V.B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty**

2
3 Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#).

4
5 Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair, who meets with the
6 faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written
7 evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

8
9 The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each probationary tenure-track faculty
10 member. This review will be conducted as follows:

- 11
12 • in the second year of the candidate's appointment, with the advice of the entire Promotion and Tenure
13 Committee;
14 • in other years in which a more elaborate formal review is not required, with the advice of a
15 subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of at least two members selected
16 annually at a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

17
18 If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The
19 department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for
20 another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written
21 comments on the review. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if
22 received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the
23 cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if provided).

24
25 If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule
26 [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded
27 to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the
28 probationary appointment.

29
30 A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted annually following the guidelines in Section IX.B.

31
32 For jointly appointed faculty with primary appointment in CSE, in preparing the annual review, the
33 Department chair must also solicit feedback from the chairs/directors of all pertinent TIUs. For
34 probationary tenure-track faculty members, faculty of practice, and research faculty members, the written
35 annual review must also be signed by the chairs/directors of all pertinent TIUs; any face-to-face meeting
36 with the faculty member to discuss the annual review must include the chairs/directors or designees from
37 all pertinent TIUs. In the case of probationary faculty, the meeting must also include some discussion of
38 the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

39
40 **V.B.1 Fourth Year Review**

41
42 During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the
43 mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are typically not solicited, and the
44 dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the
45 probationary appointment.

46
47 External evaluations are solicited only when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine
48 that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's
49 scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise
50 capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

1
2 The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty
3 votes on whether to renew the probationary appointment using the procedure given in Section VI.B.1.
4

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

12 **V.B.2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period**

13
14 Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty
15 member may exclude time from the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of
16 time excluded from or extended to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every
17 probationary year regardless of time excluded or extended. Approved exclusions or extensions do not
18 limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of appointment during an annual review.
19 Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and](#)
20 [Procedures Handbook](#).
21

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

23
24 The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each tenured faculty member. The review
25 will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty
26 member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The
27 review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance
28 needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved
29 performance.
30

31 The Department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, and the faculty member
32 will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review in writing. If necessary, the Department chair
33 will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent
34 to the faculty member. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the
35 faculty member's personnel file.
36

37 For Associate Professors, the chair shall seek input from the Professor subcommittee of the Promotion
38 and Tenure committee every two years in order to provide advice for subsequent promotion.
39

40 Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss
41 his/her/their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their
42 having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to
43 the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their
44 scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both
45 teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their
46 profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors.
47 Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and
48 students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the
49 faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other
50 members of the faculty.

1
2 If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered
3 in the annual review. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these
4 expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.
5

6 The Department chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual review
7 letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and
8 to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.
9

10 A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted every three years for associate professors with tenure, and
11 every five years for professors with tenure, following the guidelines in Section IX.B.
12

13 **V.D Faculty of Practice on the Columbus Campus**

14
15 In the penultimate contract year of a faculty of practice member's appointment, the department chair must
16 determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue,
17 the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The
18 standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.
19

20 The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each faculty of practice of each rank. The
21 review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty
22 member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The
23 review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance
24 needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved
25 performance.
26

27 In the penultimate year of appointment, the review process includes additional consultation from the
28 eligible tenure track faculty and eligible faculty of practice (Section III.A.2). For reappointment of
29 probationary faculty (first appointment), a review will be conducted by the Promotion and Tenure
30 committee utilizing 4th year review procedures for tenure track faculty (Section IV.A.1). The Promotion
31 and Tenure committee shall send a formal recommendation on reappointment to the chair. For
32 subsequent reappointments of non-probationary faculty, the department chair shall appoint an *ad hoc*
33 committee consisting of both faculty of practice and tenure-track faculty. The former will be selected by
34 the Department chair. The latter will be a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, selected by the
35 Department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. This *ad hoc*
36 committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract
37 term is ending and will make recommendations to the Department chair regarding whether the contract
38 should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next
39 faculty of practice rank (in which case see Section VI).
40

41 The Department chair will offer to meet with the faculty member to discuss the review (such a meeting is
42 required for probationary faculty members), and the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to
43 comment on the review. If necessary, the Department chair will prepare a response to the faculty
44 member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. A copy of all
45 summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.
46

47 A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted annually for probationary faculty of practice, every two
48 years for non-probationary faculty of practice below the rank of professor, and every four years for
49 faculty of practice at the professor rank, following the guidelines in Section IX.B.
50

1 **V.E Research Faculty on Columbus Campus**

2
3 In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must
4 determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue,
5 the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The
6 standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

7
8 The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each research faculty member of each
9 rank. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by
10 the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester.
11 The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of
12 performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about
13 improved performance.

14
15 In the penultimate year of appointment, the review process includes additional consultation from the
16 eligible tenure track faculty and eligible research faculty (Section III.A.3). For reappointment of
17 probationary faculty (first appointment), a review will be conducted by the Promotion and Tenure
18 committee utilizing 4th year review procedures for tenure track faculty (Section V.B.1). The Promotion
19 and Tenure committee shall send a formal recommendation on reappointment to the chair. For
20 subsequent reappointments of non-probationary faculty, the department chair shall appoint an *ad hoc*
21 committee consisting of both research faculty and tenure-track faculty. The former will be selected by the
22 Department chair. The latter will be a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, selected by the
23 Department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. This *ad hoc*
24 committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract
25 term is ending and will make recommendations to the Department chair regarding whether the contract
26 should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next
27 research faculty rank (in which case see Section VI).

28
29 The Department chair will offer to meet with the faculty member to discuss the review (such a meeting is
30 required for probationary faculty members), and the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to
31 comment on the review. If necessary, the Department chair will prepare a response to the faculty
32 member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. A copy of all
33 summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

34
35 **V.F Associated Faculty on Columbus Campus**

36
37 Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before
38 reappointment. The chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member
39 to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals.

40
41 The chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the chair may
42 extend a multiple year appointment.

43
44 Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the
45 chair, or designee, who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or
46 her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment,
47 the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The chair's decision on reappointment is final.

1 **V.G Regional Campus Faculty**

2
3 The annual performance and merit review of a regional campus probationary tenure-track or tenured
4 faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The
5 review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above for probationary tenure-track and
6 tenured faculty, respectively, on the Columbus campus. In the event of divergence in performance
7 assessment between the regional campus and the department, the chair discusses the matter with the
8 regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty
9 member receives consistent assessment and advice.

10
11 The annual performance and merit review of regional campus faculty of practice member is conducted on
12 the regional campus. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a practice faculty
13 member's annual performance and merit review letter.

14
15 The annual performance and merit review of regional campus research faculty is conducted by the
16 department and proceeds as described above for Columbus campus research faculty. The department chair
17 will provide the regional campus dean/director a copy of the faculty member's annual performance and
18 merit review letter.

19
20 The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted entirely on
21 the regional campus.
22

23 **V.H Salary Recommendations**

24
25 The chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The
26 recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the
27 performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months.
28

29 In formulating recommendations, the chair consults with the department Executive Committee. As a
30 general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the chair divides faculty into at least four
31 groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market
32 and internal equity issues. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.
33

34 Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the chair should be
35 prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are
36 solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.
37

38 Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section V.A) for an annual performance and
39 merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was
40 not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a
41 later time.
42

43 Faculty on leave for part or all of an academic year will be evaluated without prejudice for being on leave.
44 If an individual is away for part of an academic year, then the evaluation of teaching will be based on any
45 course(s) taught while present. A similar procedure will be followed for evaluation of Department and
46 University service.
47
48

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

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

VI.A Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion

VI.A.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 Research will be a critical evaluation component in the tenure and promotion process. In this research-
2 intensive department, a faculty member with an average research record will not be granted tenure even if
3 he/she has an excellent teaching and service record. On the other hand, teaching and service are also
4 important criteria in the evaluation. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of
5 substantial promise for continued growth and productivity. In summary, tenure will be reserved for
6 faculty members who have clearly demonstrated the ability and potential to become distinguished
7 scholars and recognized leaders in their research fields, who are effective teachers in the classroom and in
8 advising, and who provide high quality service to the university and to the community.

9
10 Section VI.B.1.a lists the typical examples of evidence to support cases for promotion, and the methods
11 that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

12 13 **VI.A.2 Promotion to Professor**

14
15 Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#).

16
17 The criteria for promotion to professor involve *sustained* achievement combined with the attainment of
18 *distinction* in the field. They are:

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

27
28 A strong record in teaching, scholarship, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical
29 conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors'](#)
30 [Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

31
32 Background: OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Vol. 1, 2.5.1.8, Faculty Rule [3335-6-02C](#) and (D).

33 The department acknowledges that the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution
34 of assignments, (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation
35 dimensions, and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills
36 of the faculty collectively. Evidence of the scholarship of academic leadership in one or more evaluation
37 dimensions that leads to national or international distinction may be considered in support of a case for
38 promotion. In the case where scholarship of academic leadership forms a significant component of the
39 candidate's dossier, a separate statement evaluating the leadership contributions of the candidate will be
40 added to the Promotion and Tenure committee's letter. See Section VI.B.1.a for examples that can be
41 used to support scholarship of leadership.

42 **VI.A.3 Joint Appointments**

43
44 CSE faculty with joint appointments will be evaluated on the basis of some (not necessarily all) of the
45 following criteria:

- 46 ● Teaching CSE courses and expanding CSE course offerings with interdisciplinary topics or courses
47 whose content crosses department boundaries.

- 1 ● Engaging in research collaboration with faculty whose TIU is CSE. Evidence of such collaboration
2 may be co-authored papers, joint advising of graduate students, joint research proposals to funding
3 agencies and/or joint organization of seminars and colloquia.
- 4 ● Engaging in impactful interdisciplinary activities with a substantial CSE component. Such activities
5 may include publishing research papers in CSE related conferences or journals, serving on program
6 committees or editorial boards of CSE related conferences or journals, or collaborative projects that
7 have significant CSE components and involve faculty (not necessarily OSU faculty) tenured in CSE
8 departments.

9
10 CSE faculty with joint appointments are not necessarily expected or required to fulfill all three criteria
11 listed above. At the time of the joint appointment, the CSE department chair should generate an MOU
12 that specifically outlines the expectations and evaluation of the faculty member and which of the above
13 criteria may apply.

14 **VI.A.4 Promotion of Faculty of Practice**

15
16 Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-05](#).

17 **Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice**

18
19 The criteria for an appointment to an assistant professor of practice position (Section IV.A.3) involve
20 *potential*. The criteria for promotion to associate professor of practice involve *achievement* combined
21 with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:

- 22 ● the achievement of a strong record in teaching courses involving professional practice in computing,
23 both in the classroom and in student advising;
- 24 ● the achievement of a strong record in outreach and engagement, associated typically with leadership
25 in academic program development involving professional practice in computing and related state-of-
26 the-practice activities that directly engage students;
- 27 ● the achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university; and
- 28 ● strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to
29 advance to professor of practice.

30
31 A strong record in teaching, outreach and engagement, and service are moreover defined to include
32 professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of
33 University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

34
35 Academic program development and effective teaching will be the most critical evaluation components in
36 the promotion process. On the other hand, service is also an important criterion in the evaluation. The
37 candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and
38 productivity.

39
40 A wider range of outreach and engagement activities, inclusive of scholarship, are considered for the
41 scholarship portion of the evaluation than the scholarship evaluation for tenure track and research faculty.
42 Section VI.B.1.a lists the typical examples of evidence of outreach, engagement, and scholarship, and the
43 methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

Promotion to Professor of Practice

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

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

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

A wider range of outreach and engagement activities, inclusive of scholarship, are considered for the scholarship portion of the evaluation than the scholarship evaluation for tenure track and research faculty. Section VI.B.1.a lists the typical examples of evidence of outreach, engagement, and scholarship, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

Background: OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) Vol. 1, 2.5.1.9, Faculty Rule [3335-7-05](#).

The department acknowledges that the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments, (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions, and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Evidence of the scholarship of academic leadership in one or more evaluation dimensions that leads to national or international distinction may be considered in support of a case for promotion. In the case where scholarship of academic leadership forms a significant component of the candidate's dossier, a separate statement evaluating the leadership contributions of the candidate will be added to the Promotion and Tenure committee's letter. See Section VI.B.1.a **Error! Reference source not found.** for examples that can be used to support scholarship of leadership.

VI.A.5 Promotion of Research Faculty

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

Promotion to Research Associate Professor

The criteria for an appointment to a research assistant professor position (Section IV.A.4) involve *potential*. The criteria for promotion to research associate professor involve *achievement* combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:

- the achievement of a strong record in graduate student advising, and a potential for excellence in advising;

- 1 ● the achievement of a strong record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances
2 the state-of-the-art in computing;
- 3 ● the achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university, and a
4 potential for excellence in service;
- 5 ● strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to
6 advance to research professor.
7

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

11
12 Research will be a critical evaluation component in the promotion process. The candidate must show
13 strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity.
14

15 **Promotion to Research Professor**

16
17 The criteria for promotion to research professor involve *sustained* achievement combined with the
18 attainment of *distinction* in the field. They are:

- 19 ● the sustained achievement of a strong record in graduate student advising;
- 20 ● the sustained achievement of a strong record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that
21 enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- 22 ● the sustained achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university;
- 23 ● professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#); and
- 24 ● a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or
25 international distinction.
26

27 Background: OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Vol. 1, 2.5.1.10, Faculty Rule [3335-7-32](#).

28 The department acknowledges that the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution
29 of assignments, (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation
30 dimensions, and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills
31 of the faculty collectively. Evidence of the scholarship of academic leadership in one or more evaluation
32 dimensions that leads to national or international distinction may be considered in support of a case for
33 promotion. In the case where scholarship of academic leadership forms a significant component of the
34 candidate's dossier, a separate statement evaluating the leadership contributions of the candidate will be
35 added to the Promotion and Tenure committee's letter. See Section VI.B.1.a for examples that can be
36 used to support scholarship of leadership.
37

38 **VI.A.6 Associated Faculty**

39
40 **Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor.** The relevant criteria for the
41 promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty
42 above.
43

44 **Promotion to Senior Lecturer.** Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for
45 appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.4. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer
46 after a period of service as CSE lecturer, provided they meet the following considerations for promotion
47 to senior lecturer, including teaching a variety of CSE courses, including CSE 3000 level or higher

1 courses, work on curriculum development, service as course coordinator, and/or other service to the CSE
2 department and the university. Promotion to senior lecturer is not automatic based on years of service and
3 is dependent upon the listed criteria.

4
5 **Promotion of Visiting Faculty.** Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

6 7 **VI.A.7 Regional Campus Faculty**

8
9 Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-07](#).

10
11 Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus
12 campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate
13 education and serve the academic needs of their communities. Therefore, the relative emphasis on
14 teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will typically be greater. While the Department
15 expects regional campus faculty to achieve a record of high-quality scholarship and publications, it
16 recognizes that greater teaching and service commitments and less access to research resources for
17 regional campus faculty require different research expectations. In general, tenure-track regional campus
18 faculty are not expected to have a scholarship output (or, for faculty of practice outreach and engagement
19 output inclusive of scholarship) that is as high as that for Columbus campus faculty, but the overall
20 quality of this scholarship/outreach and engagement is expected to be comparable. Similarly, non-
21 classroom teaching expectations may be altered to the locale. While graduate student advising may or
22 may not be part of the faculty member's profile, undergraduate advising/mentoring should be a
23 documented part of a tenure-track regional campus faculty member's profile.

24
25 In the evaluation for promotion of regional campus faculty of practice, research faculty, and associated
26 faculty, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each
27 of these categories.

28 29 **VI.B Procedures**

30
31 Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) and [Faculty Rule 3335-7-08](#).

32 33 **VI.B.1 Tenure-Track Faculty, Faculty of Practice, and Research Faculty**

34
35 The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully
36 consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually
37 updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and](#)
38 [Procedures Handbook](#).

39
40 Promotion and tenure reviews normally will take place in the Autumn semester; the schedule below
41 assumes this. These reviews include all mandatory reviews for faculty in the final year of a probationary
42 period, and all approved nonmandatory reviews. If a review will occur during any other semester, the
43 normal schedule below may be adjusted accordingly to allow similarly adequate time for all steps.

1 **VI.B.1.a Candidate Responsibilities**

2
3 Reference: College of Engineering [Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document](#) Section VI.A

4
5 Each faculty member being reviewed will complete the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier. The
6 Department of Computer Science and Engineering seeks to broaden participation in computing, and
7 encourages candidates to highlight contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion within the department
8 and the field as part of their dossier. Candidates will make available to the Promotion and Tenure
9 Committee copies of all publications authored or co-authored by the candidate and copies of all student
10 evaluations of instruction for courses taught by the candidate. Other significant documents normally
11 considered during the reviews will include external letters of evaluation, peer evaluations of teaching, and
12 prior annual performance evaluations. Supplementary documentation may be offered by the candidate, or
13 may be requested by the Liaison Subcommittee (see Section VI.B.1.b), the Promotion and Tenure
14 Committee chair, or the Department chair.

15
16 In addition to submitting a complete, accurate dossier, candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion
17 are responsible for providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. If
18 external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external
19 evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is
20 described in detail below:

21
22 • **Dossier**

23
24 Every candidate must submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic
25 Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist
26 without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic
27 Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

28
29 While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for
30 accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are
31 to be completed by the candidate.

32
33 The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is
34 the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the
35 last five years, whichever is less, to present.

36
37 The time period for scholarship documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty
38 is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to
39 present. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence over time. There
40 should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time.

41
42 The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the
43 start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present.

44
45 In each of the Teaching, Scholarship/Outreach and Engagement, and Service categories and in a few
46 specific subcategories of each (outlined below), ratings of the candidate's record will be provided:
47 **does not meet criteria, meets criteria, exceeds criteria.** A record rated as **meets criteria** is
48 tantamount to meeting expectations for promotion in that category.

1 **Teaching (in evaluating Tenure-Track and Practice Faculty)**

2
3 The teaching component of the review will include summary evaluations of classroom teaching,
4 curricular development, and advising of students.

5
6 **Classroom Teaching**

7
8 Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the classroom teaching sub-category of teaching will include:

- 9 • Student evaluations of instruction, including ratings and open-ended comments
10 • Peer observations of instruction
11 • Awards for teaching
12 • Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from former students regarding teaching effectiveness
13 • Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding teaching effectiveness
14 • Contributions to enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom setting.

15
16 The CSE approach to teaching assessment and feedback has two components. Direct formal assessment
17 of teaching will be conducted using the OSU student evaluation of instruction (SEI) questionnaires and
18 peer evaluation. Procedures for collection of evaluations are found in Section IX.A.

19
20 Open-ended comments from each class taught by the faculty must be collected and retained by the faculty
21 member for inclusion in their file. These comments are summarized on a course-by-course basis for
22 purposes of formal review (fourth year, promotion and tenure, or promotion to professor). The liaison
23 committee will summarize the comments for inclusion in the dossier. The summary must include the
24 name and role of the summarizer, and should be shared with the candidate. Note that an individual other
25 than the candidate must summarize the comments for inclusion in the dossier (ref [Promotion and Tenure](#)
26 [Review](#), section 4.1.4.3).

27
28 The total direct assessment of classroom teaching will be comprehensive, so that material from the range
29 of courses taught by the candidate will be examined and evaluated. Candidates for promotion to
30 professor should provide evaluations for the most recent five years.

31
32 **Curricular Development**

33
34 Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the curricular development sub-category of teaching will
35 include:

- 36 • Curricular and content development and innovations
37 • Textbook and course material development
38 • Pedagogical innovations
39 • Publications about teaching computing
40 • Awards for curricular development
41 • Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding curricular contributions
42 • Contributions to enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in curricular development

1 **Advising**
2

3 Each faculty member is expected to perform his/her fair share of academic advising to undergraduate and
4 graduate students, and to provide appropriate advice regarding course and program matters as well as
5 career and graduate school choices. The primary distinguishing factor in this sub-category of teaching
6 will be the role of the candidate in advising graduate student research leading to Ph.D. and M.S. (thesis)
7 degrees, and (to a lesser extent) senior honors theses by undergraduates. Evidence that will be evaluated
8 to assess the advising sub-category of teaching will include:

- 9 • Achievements (e.g., publications and awards) of Ph.D., M.S. thesis, and senior honors thesis students
10 advised
11 • Sustained progress toward the degree by Ph.D. and M.S. thesis students advised
12 • Service on Ph.D. dissertation and M.S. thesis committees of students who have other primary
13 advisors
14 • Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding advising contributions
15 • Contributions to enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in advising
16

17 **Scholarship (in evaluating Tenure-Track and Research Faculty)**
18

19 Scholarship for tenure-track faculty and research faculty involves primarily research that advances the
20 state-of-the-art in computing. The scholarship component of the review will include summary
21 evaluations of research quality, quantity, significance/impact, and funding.
22

23 **Publication Record**
24

25 Candidates are expected to have a research portfolio that represents superior intellectual achievement.
26 Qualitative evaluations and quantitative metrics will assess the originality, novelty, and intrinsic value of
27 research contributions as well as the quantity of these contributions. Evidence that will be evaluated to
28 holistically assess the quality of the record will include:
29

- 30 • Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (when available)
31 • Promotion and Tenure Committee members' own opinions of the quality of the work when within the
32 scope of their research expertise
33 • Prestige (reputation and visibility), selectivity, and impact factors of publication outlets
34 • Number of equivalent papers (i.e., accounting for multiple authorship and paper length) appearing in
35 or fully accepted by top publication outlets, and that can be attributed to the candidate's research
36 publication efforts
37 • Number of publications appearing in other outlets
38 • Number of substantial work products other than traditional publications (such as software), if
39 applicable
40 • Patents, patent applications, and similar evidence of technological innovation
41 • Competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically
42 important co-PI
43 • Invited presentations at other institutions
44 • Invitations to serve on editorial boards or program committees of prestigious journals or conferences
45 • Invitations to serve on government or professional organization policy-making panels and boards
46 • Special commendations and honors for research quality, e.g., professional society Fellow designation

- 1 • Contributions to enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in scholarship
2

3 Because of the wide range of applications of computing, research papers may appear in diverse journals
4 and proceedings. In many areas of the discipline, conference publications are rigorously reviewed and
5 prestigious, and can be as significant as publications in premier journals. The appendix of this document
6 (Section X) includes a discussion of legitimate and community-recognized publishing strategies for
7 Computer Science and Engineering faculty members. In traditional, more established research areas in
8 computer science, publication in recognized top research venues is encouraged. In cross-disciplinary
9 research or research in emerging areas, publication in new and/or non-traditional venues will be given
10 equal weight to publication in recognized, traditional venues.

11
12 Work products that have been taken into account in hiring the candidate generally will be of less
13 importance than those produced later. For faculty members hired as associate professor or with years
14 credited toward tenure, the totality of the record will be considered, along with the expectation for
15 productivity while at OSU.

16
17 In the case of multiple authorships, OAA specifically asks for a description of contribution of the
18 candidate. The Procedure Oversight Designee may contact non-student co-authors to confirm such
19 descriptions, and will generally consider this information to be more authoritative than speculation about
20 order of authorship in determining the candidate's contribution to joint work.

21
22 In some situations, non-traditional research products and methods of dissemination will need to be
23 evaluated. For example, a candidate might have produced software disseminated to the community via
24 network download. Data such as the number of downloads will be considered evidence of effective
25 dissemination and therefore supporting evidence for quantity of research. The candidate should provide
26 appropriate documentation to permit adequate evaluation.

27 **Significance/Impact**

28
29
30 “Significance/impact” refers to the degree to which the candidate’s work is fundamentally important for
31 the field, as well as the extent to which it has been recognized, cited, adopted, and/or built upon by others.
32 Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the significance/impact of research will include:

- 33
34 • Independent external evaluators’ opinions of the significance/impact of the work (when available)
35 • Promotion and Tenure Committee members’ own opinions of the significance/impact of the work
36 when within the scope of their research expertise
37 • Citations of the candidate's work by others
38 • Actual adoption and use of the candidate's research results and techniques, or other work products
39 (such as software), by others

40
41 When external evaluators’ opinions are sought, candidates will be asked to provide a portfolio of
42 significant work products for inclusion in the request for evaluation. These will typically be a set of
43 publications representing the scholarly work of the candidate, but may include other artifacts of activities
44 in the record.

45 **Funding**

46
47
48 As noted above, competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts to support research (and where
49 they are from) will be considered in evaluating the quality of the candidate's research program. Such
50 funding is also an independently important aspect of scholarship because of the expectation that the

1 candidate will obtain funding to support graduate students to do research and will contribute to the
2 financial stability of the department. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess funding of research will
3 include:

- 4
- 5 • Grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically important co-PI
- 6 • Number of graduate students supported with external funding
- 7 • Total amount of external funding for the candidate's research program
- 8 • Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from collaborators, especially the PI, documenting the
- 9 importance of the candidate's role in obtaining the funding and accomplishing the work for funded
- 10 projects where the candidate is a co-PI
- 11

12 All external funding, regardless of source, that supports students and for which the CSE Department
13 and/or a CSE-related center gets appropriate expenditure credit will be considered equally important in
14 rating the funding sub-category of research.

15
16 **Scholarship of Leadership (in evaluating candidates for Tenured Professor, Professor of Practice,**
17 **and Research Professor)**

18
19 References: OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Vol. 1, 2.5.1.8; 2.5.1.9; and 2.5.1.10; Faculty Rules
20 [3335-6-02](#)(C) and (D); [3335-7-05](#); and [3335-7-32](#)

21
22 Evidence of the scholarship of academic leadership that leads to national or international distinction may
23 be considered in support of a case for promotion (Section VI.A.2). Candidates who wish to have
24 examples of leadership should document their leadership in the dossier; examples of academic leadership
25 aligned with service roles should demonstrate impact above and beyond the standard responsibilities for
26 the role. Evidence that will be evaluated may include:

- 27
- 28 • Leadership in systemic changes in educational delivery
- 29 • Leadership in development of strategic partnerships and programs within the university and
- 30 across organizations
- 31 • Leadership in program evaluation including national accreditation agencies
- 32 • Leadership in broadening participation in computing
- 33 • Leadership in innovative corporate engagement
- 34 • Leadership in technology transfer of computing innovations to practice
- 35 • Leadership of science and engineering policy and goal setting, for instance, through National
- 36 Academies and Congressional Testimony
- 37

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

40
41 **Service (in evaluating Tenure-Track and Practice Faculty, and Research Faculty as**
42 **described in Section VI.A.5)**

43
44 The service component of the review will include summary evaluations of internal service and external
45 service.

46
47 **Internal Service**

48
49 Every faculty member is expected to contribute to the effective governance of the department, and senior
50 faculty are expected to contribute to the effective governance of the college and university as well.

1 Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the internal (department, college, and university) sub-category of
2 service will include:
3

- 4 • Effective involvement and active participation in assigned department, college, and university
5 committees
- 6 • Demonstration of initiative and follow-through in identifying and helping to address specific
7 departmental problems
- 8 • Observations made by Promotion and Tenure Committee members who have served with the
9 candidate on committees and/or have been served by the candidate's activities

10
11 **External Service**
12

13 Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the external (professional and community) sub-category of
14 service will include:
15

- 16 • Professional activities such as service on conference organizing and program committees, editorships,
17 reviewing, etc.
- 18 • Reviewing of proposals for funding agencies
- 19 • Public service related to the candidate's professional expertise
- 20 • Consulting activities

21
22 **Outreach and Engagement, inclusive of Scholarship (in evaluating Faculty of Practice)**
23

24 **Record of Contributions**
25

26 Contributions to the outreach, engagement, and scholarship mission of the department for faculty of
27 practice involves activities that increase the outreach and engagement of the department as well as
28 advancing or deploying the state-of-the-art in novel ways.
29

30 Examples of contributions to outreach, engagement, and scholarship mission of the department include:
31

- 32 • Engagement with industry or cross-disciplinary partners in the development of novel education
33 programs, including bootcamps, stackable certificates, and translational degrees.
- 34 • Participation in research/development projects, including cross-disciplinary efforts
- 35 • Participation in national or international committees or organizations that connects the
36 department to broader initiatives
- 37 • Engagement with industry, community, and government including supervising joint projects and
38 developing capstone experiences
- 39 • Engagement in initiatives that broaden the participation of computing
- 40 • Technology transfer and patents
- 41 • Publication in commercial outlets documenting best practices
- 42 • Publication of papers in scholarly publications, including research or pedagogical conferences
43 and journals
- 44 • Funded research or engagement projects, including service as consultant or subject matter expert
- 45 • Contributions to enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in outreach and engagement

46
47 This list is not exhaustive and candidates may include additional examples of contributions to the
48 outreach, engagement, and scholarship mission that are of comparable scope in their dossier.
49

1 If appropriate, competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts to support research (and where they
2 are from) can be considered in evaluating the quality of the candidate's research program. Such
3 evaluation may consider the number and amount of grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is
4 the PI or a critically important co-PI, the number of students supported with external funding, and letters
5 (not solicited by the candidate) from collaborators, especially the PI, documenting the importance of the
6 candidate's role in obtaining the funding and accomplishing the work for funded projects where the
7 candidate is a co-PI. All external funding that supports students and for which the CSE Department
8 and/or a CSE-related center gets appropriate expenditure credit will be considered equally important.
9

10 Because of the wide range of applications of computing, publication contributions may appear in diverse
11 journals and proceedings. In many areas of the discipline, conference publications are rigorously
12 reviewed and prestigious, and can be as significant as publications in premier journals. The appendix of
13 this document (Section X) includes a discussion of legitimate and community-recognized publishing
14 strategies for Computer Science and Engineering faculty members. In research in traditional, more
15 established areas in computer science, publication in recognized top research venues is encouraged. In
16 cross-disciplinary research or research in emerging areas, publication in new and/or non-traditional
17 venues will be given equal weight to publication in recognized, traditional venues.
18

19 Work products that have been taken into account in hiring the candidate generally will be of less
20 importance than those produced later. For faculty members hired as associate professor or with years
21 credited toward tenure, the totality of the record will be considered, along with the expectation for
22 productivity while at OSU.
23

24 In the case of multiple authorships, OAA specifically asks for a description of contribution of the
25 candidate. The Promotion and Tenure Committee may contact non-student co-authors to confirm such
26 descriptions, and will generally consider this information to be more authoritative than speculation about
27 order of authorship in determining the candidate's contribution to joint work.
28

29 In some situations, non-traditional research products and methods of dissemination will need to be
30 evaluated. For example, a candidate might have produced software disseminated to the community via
31 network download. Data such as the number of downloads will be considered evidence of effective
32 dissemination and therefore supporting evidence for quantity of research. The candidate should provide
33 appropriate documentation to permit adequate evaluation.
34

35 **Significance/Impact**

36

37 "Significance/impact" refers to the degree to which the candidate's work is fundamentally important for
38 the field, as well as the extent to which it has been recognized, cited, adopted, and/or built upon by others.
39 Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the significance/impact of research will include:
40

- 41 • Independent external evaluators' opinions of the significance/impact of the work (when available)
 - 42 • Promotion and Tenure Committee members' own opinions of the significance/impact of the work
43 when within the scope of their research expertise
 - 44 • Citations of the candidate's work by others
 - 45 • Actual adoption and use of the candidate's research results and techniques, or other work products
46 (such as software), by others
- 47

48 When external evaluators opinions are sought, candidates will be asked to provide a portfolio of
49 significant work products for inclusion in the request for evaluation. These may include documentation

1 of any of the contributions of the outreach, engagement, and scholarship of the candidate (e.g., formal
2 documentation of novel program development, publications, industrial involvement).

3
4 • **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document**

5
6 Candidates must also submit a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates
7 may submit the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed
8 under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT
9 document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter
10 documents is the more recent. However, the current APT document must be used if the letter of
11 offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the
12 review year. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

13
14 • **External Evaluations**

15
16 As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list
17 of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure
18 Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so.
19 The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the
20 request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations
21 below.)

22
23 **VI.B.1.b Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities**

24
25 The Promotion and Tenure Committee is the same as the eligible faculty for a case (Section III.A). The
26 responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

- 27
- 28 • To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
 - 29
 - 30 • To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory
31 review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to
32 take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of
33 professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the
34 review to proceed.
 - 35
 - 36 ○ The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty
37 member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full
38 review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is
39 necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - 40
 - 41 ○ A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule
42 [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty
43 member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete
44 documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - 45
 - 46 ○ A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible
47 faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive
48 recommendation during the review itself.
 - 49

- 1 • Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the
2 promotion and tenure review process as described below.
3
- 4 ○ **Late Spring:** Select from among its members Procedures Oversight Designee(s) (PODs) who
5 will serve in this role for the following year. One POD will be selected from the eligible faculty
6 for the tenure-track cases, one for faculty of practice cases, and one for research cases; this may
7 be the same individual. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who
8 chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the
9 Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
10
- 11 ○ **Late Spring:** The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will appoint a two-person **Liaison**
12 **Subcommittee** of the eligible faculty for each faculty member who will be undergoing review for
13 promotion and tenure or for promotion in the next academic year. One of the two will be
14 designated as the chair of that subcommittee. The candidate may suggest one additional faculty
15 member to join the subcommittee. The Liaison Subcommittee members will explain and be
16 available to answer questions the candidate may have concerning the preparation of the dossier.
17 The Liaison Subcommittee also will be responsible for gathering any materials deemed relevant
18 to the review, including a sealed list of names of potential external evaluators suggested by the
19 candidate and known only to the candidate. Under no circumstances will the candidate solicit
20 letters of evaluation or have contact of any type with prospective or actual evaluators regarding
21 the review process.
22
- 23 • Members of the P&T Committee who are eligible to vote on the candidate's case (the eligible
24 faculty) meet and identify a list of appropriate external evaluators to whom requests for
25 evaluation could be sent. The P&T Committee Chair will provide the list to the candidate, who
26 then has the option of suggesting the removal of up to two names, and providing up to three
27 alternate names for addition to the list. The Promotion and Tenure Committee then identifies a
28 subset from this list as primary evaluators, along with a number of alternates (to be requested to
29 write letters if primary evaluators decline to write). Careful attention must be paid to balance
30 among the evaluators in all relevant respects and as indicated in the Faculty Rules.
- 31
- 32 ○ **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations),
33 and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to
34 assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
35
- 36 ○ Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an
37 opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the
38 candidate's record.
39
- 40 ○ The chairs of the Liaison Subcommittees will lead the discussions of the respective candidates'
41 cases. The cases of all candidates for a given rank will be discussed before voting takes place on
42 any of them.
43
- 44 ○ Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to
45 the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case,
46 where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its
47 analysis of the record.
48

- 1 ○ Revise the draft analysis of each case following the eligible faculty meeting, to include the faculty
2 vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the
3 completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
4
- 5 ○ Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that
6 warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
7
- 8 ○ Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint
9 appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not
10 vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-
11 initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
12
- 13 ○ **Late Autumn:** The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will appoint a two-person **Liaison**
14 **Subcommittee** of the eligible faculty for each faculty member who will be undergoing fourth
15 year review or probationary reappointment review in the next semester. The candidate may
16 suggest one additional faculty member to join the subcommittee. One of the two will be
17 designated as the chair of that subcommittee. The Liaison Subcommittee members will explain
18 and be available to answer questions the candidate may have concerning the preparation of the
19 dossier. The Liaison Subcommittee also will be responsible for gathering any materials deemed
20 relevant to the review.
21
- 22 ● To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which
23 the candidate's case will be discussed.
24
- 25 ● To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent
26 attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
27

28 **VI.B.1.c Department Chair Responsibilities**

29 The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:
30

- 31
- 32 ● **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from the list provided by the Promotion and
33 Tenure Committee after vetting by the candidate. The Department chair will send official letters
34 soliciting the evaluations, normally by early Summer semester. Each letter will be accompanied by a
35 current curriculum vitae and up to five representative publications chosen by the candidate. The
36 Department chair will monitor receipt of the evaluation letters to ensure that they are received by the
37 beginning of the review semester. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
38
- 39 ● To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment.
40
- 41 ● To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based
42 on criteria.
43
- 44 ● To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate
45 now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The
46 department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory
47 manner.)
48
- 49 ● To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at
50 least one week before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
 - To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
 - **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
 - To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
 - To 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.
 - To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
 - To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
 - To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

VI.B.2 Nonmandatory Reviews for Promotion and Tenure or for Promotion

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

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

49
50

The eligible voters for a prospective case will consider the request and, by April 30, decide whether a formal review will be conducted. The affected faculty member will be notified of the decision and, if it is

1 negative, the rationale. The eligible faculty may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for
2 promotion more than one year in succession. (Faculty Rule [3335-6-04-\(A\)-3](#))
3

4 **VI.B.3 Promotion and Tenure Committee Voting Procedures**

5

6 See Section III.C for definition of quorum and Section III.D for definition of positive recommendation.
7

8 As the CSE department believes in open discussion about cases, those who attend the voting meeting will
9 vote by show of hands—yes (in favor of promotion and tenure or promotion) or no (against). Any
10 eligible faculty who fails to make their vote known to the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair at the
11 meeting will be recorded as not voting. The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will then record and
12 announce the vote totals to the entire Committee.
13

14 The Liaison Subcommittee for a candidate, with the assistance of the Promotion and Tenure Committee
15 chair, will be responsible for drafting the Committee's recommendation letter for that candidate. All
16 members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will have the opportunity to examine and make
17 suggestions regarding the letter before it is presented to the Department chair; but the final letter will
18 come from, and will be the responsibility of, the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair.
19

20 **VI.B.4 Summary of Normal Promotion and Tenure Schedules**

21

22 Mid-Spring: Requests due on reviews for nonmandatory promotion and tenure, and decisions made on
23 requests for nonmandatory reviews; Liaison Subcommittees appointed for mandatory and nonmandatory
24 reviews, and for fourth year reviews.
25

26 Late Spring/Early Summer: Evaluation letters solicited for tenure and promotion reviews.
27

28 Fall: Tenure and promotion reviews conducted.
29

30 Early Spring: Fourth year and reappointment reviews conducted.
31

32 **VI.B.5 Procedures for Associated Faculty**

33

34 Adjunct faculty, for whom promotion is a possibility, follow the promotion guidelines and procedures
35 detailed in Section VI.B.1 above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level
36 if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the executive vice
37 president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.
38

39 **VI.B.6 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty**

40

41 Regional campus tenure-track faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the
42 process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus
43 review focuses on teaching and service. The regional campus dean/director forwards the written
44 evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point
45 the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote
46 requires agreement by the dean/director and the department chair.
47

48 Regional campus faculty of practice are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process
49 established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. Following the review, the

1 dean/director consults with the faculty member's department chair. A request to promote follows the
2 same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a
3 component of the assigned role.

4
5 The review of regional campus research faculty takes place on the Columbus campus and follows the
6 same procedures as those described above for Columbus campus research faculty. Following the review,
7 the department chair will consult with the regional campus dean/director. A request to promote requires
8 agreement by the regional campus dean/director and the department chair.

9
10 Associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on
11 that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The decision of the regional campus
12 dean/director is final.

13 14 **VI.B.7 External Evaluations**

15
16 External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which
17 scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews
18 and all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly
19 activity and research are not obtained for faculty of practice or associated faculty unless the faculty
20 member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external
21 evaluations for a faculty of practice or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair
22 after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

23
24 Evaluations that assess the quality and impact of the teaching and service of professional practice faculty
25 candidates under consideration for promotion are to be obtained. The source and content of evaluations
26 for faculty of practice promotion candidates should reflect the contributions expected of faculty of
27 practice members. Evaluations should address the extent and quality of teaching as characterized by
28 internal and external evaluations of instruction and the quality of contributions through outreach and
29 engagement with industry, the educational community and the broad community of practitioners as
30 appropriate for the individual under review. Evaluations should also address the extent and quality of
31 professional service to the Department, College and University. Evaluations of practice faculty should
32 derive from external authoritative and reputable sources qualified to comment substantively on the
33 contributions and accomplishments of the faculty member.

34
35 A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation:

- 36
37
- 38 • Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if
39 relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or
40 post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the
41 evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. Evaluators should be
42 distinguished faculty (or occasionally non-academics who have similar research credentials and
43 experience) as evidenced by scholarly records and awards. Evaluators shall be in a position to
44 comment in an informed way both on the quality of the candidate's scholarly work and on its
45 significance to the broader field in which it resides. External evaluators must be able to provide an
46 objective evaluation of the scholarly work. Faculty external evaluators should generally hold the rank
47 of professor; they must be at the rank above the candidate being considered unless an exception has
48 been granted by the college.
 - 49 • Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's
50 usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under

1 no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits
2 of the case.

3
4 Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received,
5 more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring
6 semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than
7 five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

8
9 As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee,
10 the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for
11 credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that
12 no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the
13 candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the
14 Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators
15 suggested by the candidate.

16
17 The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external
18 evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for faculty of
19 practice can be found [here](#).

20
21 Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with
22 external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should
23 initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such
24 communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what,
25 if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that
26 letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural
27 lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

28
29 All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier. If concerns arise
30 about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the department’s written evaluations
31 or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

32 33 **VII Appeals**

34
35 Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions.
36 Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

37
38 Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty
39 member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written
40 policies and procedures.

41 42 **VIII Seventh Year Review**

43
44 Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh-Year Review for a
45 faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth-year (mandatory tenure) review.

46 47 **IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation**

1 **IX.A Student Evaluation of Teaching**
2

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

10 **IX.B Peer Evaluation of Teaching**
11

12 The chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process. The chair may delegate this
13 authority to a faculty member, typically an associate chair.
14

15 Peer reviews of teaching (by faculty selected by the chair or designee) will be conducted annually for
16 probationary tenure-track faculty and faculty of practice. A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted
17 every three years for associate professors with tenure, and every five years for professors with tenure. A
18 peer teaching evaluation will be conducted every two years for non-probationary faculty of practice below
19 the rank of professor and every four years for faculty of practice at the professor rank. At least two
20 different faculty reviewers will be selected for each faculty member during his/her probationary period.
21 These will be part of the candidate's record to be considered in such reviews.
22

23 Peer reviews of teaching consist of three components: classroom observation, review of classroom
24 materials, and one or more face-to-face post-visit meetings to discuss the classroom observation and class
25 material assessments. Classroom observations and review of materials are recorded using standard
26 departmental review forms. At the beginning of the academic year, the timing of the assessments should
27 be discussed between reviewer and the person being observed to ensure that the candidate can benefit
28 maximally from the timing of the visit; the person being observed will have been informed in advance
29 when an assessment is to be conducted. The review forms are retained in the observed faculty's
30 departmental folder, with a copy given to the observed faculty. Faculty may optionally choose to respond
31 to the review with written comments, to be placed in the departmental folder. The reports are included in
32 the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. A subsequent peer review may be added if the candidate so
33 requests.
34

35 Peer review of probationary faculty in their first year of service is to be formative only; in this case the
36 above procedure is used (observation, material review, post-visit meeting) but the materials are for the
37 faculty's formative use; review forms are not submitted to the department folder. Instead, a note
38 indicating the date of observation is placed in the faculty's file.
39

40 **X Appendix: Publication Strategies for CSE Faculty**
41

42 The Department of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
43 (APT) document includes this statement regarding judgments about research quality: "Because of the
44 wide range of applications of computing, research papers may appear in very diverse journals and
45 proceedings. In addition, in many areas of the discipline, conference publications are rigorously reviewed
46 and prestigious, and can be as significant as publications in premier journals."
47

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

4
5 Research faculty in most disciplines are expected to publish the results of scholarly activities in "archival"
6 publications, i.e., "place[s] or collection[s] containing records, documents, or other materials of historical
7 interest" [*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition*, Houghton Mifflin,
8 1992]. In many fields, the archival publications are academic journals and books. The obviously correct
9 publication strategy is to publish in these outlets.

10
11 This is not the case in computer science (CS). Since about 1970—essentially from the time of
12 establishment of the first university CS departments, and well before the age of digital libraries that now
13 make nearly every publication "archival"—there have been many widely held and widely read series of
14 conference¹ proceedings in CS. The consequence is that there is a second reasonable publication strategy
15 for CS faculty: to publish papers in such conference proceedings in addition to, or even instead of,
16 publishing similar papers in journals. Indeed, sometimes publications that are nominally journals devote
17 special issues to the publication of major conference proceedings with which they ally themselves. Thus,
18 it is not always clear whether a given paper is a journal paper or a conference proceedings paper.

19
20 But the distinction does not matter as much in CS as in most other academic fields. The important point
21 is that papers in the best CS journals and those in the best CS conference proceedings are nearly
22 indistinguishable in many important respects. The papers submitted to most CS conferences are typically
23 10 camera-ready pages, not short abstracts that are commonly reviewed and/or published by conferences
24 in many other fields. These full papers are subject to peer review by three or more referees with rigor
25 comparable to reviews for the best journals. The reputations of the best conference proceedings in CS are
26 similar to those of the best journals. Acceptance rates for the best conferences are comparable to, or
27 lower than, those of the best journals. Objective "impact ratings" based on citation rates to papers of the
28 best conference proceedings are comparable to, or higher than, those of the best journals. The most
29 respected researchers in the field publish in certain conference proceedings. And, of course, all the top
30 conference proceedings are searchable and retrievable on-line from digital libraries run by the
31 professional organizations serving computer science (e.g., ACM and IEEE). In fact, these societies are
32 usually the main conference sponsors.

33
34 Why do many CS faculty prefer to publish papers in conference proceedings rather than in journals?
35 There are three main reasons. First, the CS field is fast-moving, and the generally much shorter turn-
36 around time of conference proceedings (submission to publication) makes for more timely publication of
37 results. Second, an accepted paper is the faculty member's ticket to speak (for 20-30 minutes) in front of
38 an audience of peers, to get rapid additional turn-around on ideas, and to establish new working
39 relationships. The opportunity to meet new people and to have this sort of personal interaction is an
40 important factor in much CS research, which tends to be interdisciplinary by nature. Finally, as top
41 journals offer on-line access through society-sponsored digital libraries, the circulation of paper
42 subscriptions—which other scholars might routinely browse for interesting papers—is declining. In fact,
43 some professional society journals in CS are now exclusively on-line, with no print versions whatsoever.
44 Conferences, with their opportunities for personal interaction, are thus becoming more rather than less
45 important in terms of research visibility. We would not be surprised to see other fields move in this
46 direction in the future, and for the same reasons.

47

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

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

15
16 Not all conferences, and not all journals, are of comparable quality. A given journal or conference
17 proceedings will be evaluated as a top publication outlet using the following criteria:
18 1. there is a consensus among knowledgeable members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee
19 that its overall reputation for publishing quality work is excellent;
20 2. acknowledged leaders in the field consistently publish in it;
21 3. it consistently has a documented acceptance rate that suggests only the best submitted papers pass
22 its peer review process;
23 4. it is among the top publication outlets in its subarea of CS in terms of the journal "impact factor"
24 as defined by the ISI [Web of Science](#), or other "impact rating" services with credible approaches
25 to assessing publication impact.

26
27 Section VI.B.1.a notes that research venues, particularly in cross-disciplinary research or research in
28 emerging areas, may result in publications in new and/or non-traditional venues. In these cases, the
29 candidate should work with faculty mentors to document the quality of newer venues, particularly in
30 terms of points 2 and 3 above.