

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures
Department of Biomedical Engineering

Table of Contents

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures	1
I Preamble	4
II Department Mission	4
III Definitions.....	5
A Departmental Faculty for Making Recommendations on Hiring.....	5
B Eligible Faculty for Voting on Appointments, Reappointments, Contract Renewal, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure	5
1 Tenure-track Faculty	5
2 Practice Faculty.....	6
3 Research Faculty	6
4 Conflict of Interest	6
5 Minimum Composition.....	7
C Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (AP&T) Committee	7
D Quorum	7
E Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	7
1 Appointment	7
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal.....	8
IV Appointments.....	8
A Criteria	8
1 Tenure-track Faculty	8
2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus	9
3 Practice Faculty.....	9
4 Research Faculty	11
5 Associated Faculty	11
6 Emeritus Faculty	12
7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	13
B Procedures	13
1 Tenure-track Faculty	13
2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus	15
3 Practice Faculty.....	16
4 Research Faculty	16
5 Transfer from the Tenure-track.....	16
6 Associated Faculty	17
7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	17
V Annual Review Procedures.....	17
A Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	18
1 Regional Campus Faculty	18
2 Fourth-Year Review.....	19

Department of Biomedical Engineering: Appointments, Tenure and Promotions (AP&T)

Approval by BME Faculty on August 15, 2019; OAA on February 3, 2020

3 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period.....	19
B Tenured Faculty.....	20
C Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus.....	20
D Practice Faculty.....	20
E Research Faculty.....	21
F Associated Faculty.....	22
G Special Considerations for Reappointment and Contract Renewal for Practice and Research Faculty.....	22
VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards.....	23
A Criteria.....	23
B Procedures.....	24
C Documentation.....	24
VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	24
A Criteria.....	25
1 Teaching.....	25
2 Scholarship.....	26
3 Service.....	27
4 Professional Ethics.....	27
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	27
2 Promotion to Professor.....	30
Teaching.....	31
Scholarship.....	31
Service.....	32
4 Regional Campus Faculty.....	33
5 Practice Faculty.....	33
6 Research Faculty.....	34
B Procedures.....	35
1 Candidate Responsibilities.....	35
2 Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities.....	35
3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities.....	37
4 Department Chair Responsibilities.....	37
5 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty.....	38
6 External Evaluations.....	38
C Documentation.....	39
1 Teaching.....	40
2 Scholarship.....	40
3 Service.....	41
VIII Appeals.....	41
IX Seventh-Year Reviews.....	41
X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	41
A Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	41
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	42
Appendix A: BME Peer Teaching Evaluation Form:.....	44
Appendix B: Timeline Guide:.....	48

Department of Biomedical Engineering: Appointments, Tenure and Promotions (AP&T)
Approval by BME Faculty on August 15, 2019; OAA on February 3, 2020

Tenure cases:.....	48
4 th Year Review cases:.....	49
Annual Review: probationary and tenured faculty members:	50

I Preamble

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

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

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

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

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal opportunity (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

II Department Mission

Mission:

*Our mission is to promote learning and discovery
that integrate engineering and life sciences
for the advancement of human health.*

Vision:

The department of Biomedical Engineering at The Ohio State University will be nationally ranked and internationally recognized for:

- The distinctive educational opportunities for its students and the outstanding achievements of its alumni,
- Faculty and staff excellence and opportunities for continuing professional development,
- Collaborative research with global impact on improving human health, and
- Service to the field of biomedical engineering and the community.

BME Values:

In addition to the University and College of Engineering statements about shared values, we amplify and add emphasis with the following list of shared values in Biomedical Engineering:

- Collaboration, collegiality, and respect
- Discoveries and Innovations that improve human health
- Integrity and ethical behavior
- Lifelong learning

III Definitions

A Departmental Faculty for Making Recommendations on Hiring

Efficient and effective operation of the department of Biomedical Engineering often require full faculty participation. In particular, all faculty that have a stake in the Biomedical Engineering department are expected to fully engage in faculty recruitment procedures and to voice their opinions during faculty meetings that result in recommendations to the chair. The Departmental Faculty who can vote on a hiring recommendation to the Department Chair will include all tenure-track and clinical/practice departmental faculty (TIU in BME or faculty that were assigned to the Biomedical Engineering Center prior to departmental formation).

B Eligible Faculty for Voting on Appointments, Reappointments, Contract Renewal, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure

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

The Department Chair, the Dean and assistant and associate Deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2 Practice Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a practice assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all practice faculty in the department.
- For appointment (hiring) at senior rank (practice associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

3 Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.
- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

4 Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some

way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion or reappointment review of that candidate.

5 Minimum Composition

The minimum composition of the committee is three eligible faculty members. If there are not three eligible faculty members with their TIU in Biomedical Engineering available, and in keeping with past policy, up to three eligible faculty members holding courtesy or joint appointments in the department will be appointed to undertake the reviews, as needed to reach the minimum composition of the committee. If none are available, the department chair will consult with the Dean to appoint one or more professors from other TIUs to serve on the BME committee to ensure the minimum composition of three professors for a review.

C Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (AP&T) Committee

The BME department has an Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (AP&T) that assists the eligible faculty in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee must consist of at least 3 professors and may include nonprobationary practice/research faculty. When considering promotion and tenure cases involving tenure track faculty, the AP&T committee will not include practice or research faculty. When considering cases involving practice faculty, the AP&T will not include research faculty.

The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the BME Department Chair and may be revised on a yearly basis.

D Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

E Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. Note this applies to candidates being considered for partial appointments in more than one department (i.e. partial FTEs) where the BME department is the primary TIU.

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

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive. Note this applies to candidates who have a partial appointment in more than one department (i.e. partial FTEs) where the BME department is the primary TIU.

IV Appointments

A Criteria

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. If an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment. (Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)).

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

Assistant Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a tenure track assistant professor has, at a minimum an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience; a potential for excellence in teaching, as demonstrated by a record of quality teaching and/or excellence in verbal and written communication; a potential for excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by having produced a body of research, scholarly and creative work appropriate to the discipline of Biomedical Engineering; a potential to perform effective service, including a commitment to good citizenship and collegiality within the Department of Biomedical Engineering; strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the BME Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the P&T committee of the primary TIU in the case of jointly appointed faculty) determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as an associate professor with tenure has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of

Biomedical Engineering (or the TIU of the primary appointment in the case of jointly appointed faculty) criteria for appointment as a tenure track assistant professor and met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure. An offeree who has not held a faculty position will be determined to have met the criteria by evaluating their record over a similar period with consideration given to the fact that they may have exceptional strengths in certain areas (e.g. research innovation) with nontraditional experience in others (e.g. teaching/mentoring in nonacademic setting). Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure, however a probationary appointment at senior rank may be appropriate under certain circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a professor with tenure has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering (or the TIU of the primary appointment in the case of jointly appointed faculty) criteria for appointment as an associate professor with tenure and met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering (or the TIU of the primary appointment in the case of jointly appointed faculty) criteria for promotion to professor. An offeree who has not held a faculty position will be determined to have met the criteria by evaluating their record over their professional career with consideration given to the fact that they may have exceptional strengths in certain areas (e.g. research innovation) with nontraditional experience in others (e.g. teaching/mentoring in nonacademic setting). Appointment at the rank of professor normally entails tenure, however a probationary appointment at senior rank may be appropriate under certain circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality. Nonetheless, candidates must be involved in recognized scholarly activity appropriate to the discipline in which appointment is being considered.

3 Practice Faculty

Clinical faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering will be referred to as “Assistant, Associate, or Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering.” Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate. These appointments have some expectations for scholarly promise and/or accomplishments, but with a greater emphasis on excellence in teaching and scholarship related to professional engineering practice and lesser emphasis on research publication and external research

funding. Research per se is not acceptable as an evaluation criterion for hiring. Although an earned Ph.D. is normally required, exceptions can be made for extremely well qualified candidates. An M.S. degree is required and significant industrial or governmental professional experience can be counted in place of a Ph.D.

Criteria and policies governing appointment of practice faculty must be consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Reappointment is based on the candidate's performance and on the continued needs of the TIU.

Practice faculty may participate with voting rights in matters of governance and committee service at the Department level, except that they cannot participate or vote on promotion and tenure matters of tenure track faculty (Faculty Rule 3335-7-04(A)). Biomedical Engineering includes a description that describes the governance rights to be extended to practice faculty members in the Pattern of Administration (POA).

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

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

Assistant Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as assistant professor of practice has, at a minimum capability in the offeree's area of specialization experience in the practice of the discipline attained professional accomplishment the background and ability to share and transfer knowledge to students. Normally, the offeree will have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field. Professional publications and actual teaching experience is helpful but not required.

Associate Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as an associate professor of practice has, at a minimum, exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for appointment as an assistant professor of practice met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for promotion to associate professor of practice. An offeree will be determined to have met the same criteria defined for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice.

Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a professor of practice has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for appointment as an associate professor of practice met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for promotion to professor of practice. An offeree will be determined to have met the same criteria defined for promotion to Professor of Practice.

4 Research Faculty

Research faculty in the College of Engineering will be referred to as “Research Assistant, Associate, or Professor in the Department of Biomedical Engineering”. Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate.

Criteria and policies associated with research faculty appointments must be consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Research faculty members may participate with voting rights in matters of governance and committee service at the Department level, except that they cannot participate or vote on promotion and tenure matters of tenure track faculty or practice faculty ([Faculty Rule 3335-7-37](#)). Biomedical Engineering includes a description that describes the governance rights to be extended to research faculty members in the Pattern of Administration (POA).

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

Research Assistant Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as research assistant professor has, at a minimum, a record of high quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a research associate professor has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for appointment as a research assistant professor and met or exceeded the College and TIU criteria for promotion to research associate professor. An offeree will be determined to have met the same criteria defined for promotion to Research Associate Professor.

Research Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a research professor has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for appointment as a research associate professor and met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for promotion to research professor. An offeree will be determined to have met the same criteria defined for promotion to Research Professor.

5 Associated Faculty

Associated faculty are persons with clinical practice titles, adjunct titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles. Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than fifty per cent service to the university are also associated faculty members. Persons with tenure track, practice, or research faculty titles may not hold associated titles. Persons holding associated titles are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure track, practice, or research faculty. Persons with associated titles are permitted to participate in college governance and Department of Biomedical Engineering governance where approved by a vote of at least a majority of all of its tenure track faculty. Associated faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of three consecutive years and may be renewed ([Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#)).

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

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are appropriate only for individuals who provide substantial service to the academic or research mission of the appointing unit. The Biomedical Engineering department, along with the College, will establish guidelines for the circumstances in which such adjunct faculty may identify themselves as Ohio State faculty. Typically the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.

Adjunct Instructor of Practice, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Practice, Adjunct Associate Professor of Practice, Adjunct Professor of Practice. Associated clinical appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Uncompensated appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated academic service to the Department of Biomedical Engineering, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Associated clinical rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of clinical faculty. Associated clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of practice faculty.

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

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

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

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

6 Emeritus Faculty

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

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

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

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

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook) (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>) for information on the following topics:

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with university and college policies and practices set forth in the most recent updates of the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

The Dean of the college provides approval for the Department of Biomedical Engineering to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise and may or may not include guidance on faculty with the potential for appointments to more than one TIU within the College of Engineering.

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. In the case of searches targeting jointly appointed faculty, the primary appointment TIU will be responsible for assembling the search committee, which must include at least one representative from the secondary TIU. Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college with resources from the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#).

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Representative who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to use best practices in developing a diverse pool of qualified applicants. The Diversity Representative is responsible for ensuring that the committee process conforms with University Policy 1.10 Affirmative Action, Equal Employment Opportunity & Non - Discrimination/Harassment.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. Approved positions must be posted in the University Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally professional journal.
- Subject to specific Department of Biomedical Engineering procedures, screens applications and letters of recommendation, conducts remote interviews (i.e. skype, zoom or other remote video phone interviews) and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants judged worthy of an on-site interview. At meeting of the departmental faculty, these applicants are discussed and a vote is taken on whom to invite for on-campus interviews. Only a simple majority is required for invitations and if more than three candidates are deemed worthy of an on-site interview, the department chair in consultation with the search committee chair can reduce the number of on-site interviews. Interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the Department of Biomedical Engineering main office. If no candidates receive the required 50% positive vote for interview, the department chair will determine the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being, invite a candidate with <50% support). In the case of searches targeting jointly appointed faculty, the primary appointment TIU will have responsibility in identifying candidates for interview, while all potential TIUs are to be included in the interview process.

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; the department chair; and the Dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Subject to specific Department of Biomedical Engineering procedures, following completion of on-campus interviews, the departmental faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate (Note the definition of departmental faculty for new appointments is described in section III.B). At this meeting two separate votes are conducted. First, each departmental faculty is asked to vote on a yes-no basis if the candidate is or is not acceptable for the open position. Only yes or no votes are recorded. Any abstentions will be removed but the presence of the faculty member will be counted towards the required quorum. Second, a rank order vote is conducted for all candidates that receive the required 2/3 positive vote. For this second rank order vote, each departmental faculty will be asked to list in rank order their preferred candidates. This rank-order will form a recommendation to the department chair but the department chair will then independently decide which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

If the offer involves tenure or a senior/non-Assistant Professor rank, the eligible faculty at a higher or equivalent rank under consideration also vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor or professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair.

A draft letter of offer to a tenure track faculty candidate, accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae and appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications, must be submitted to engineering administration for review and approval by the Dean. Engineering administration will review the draft letter of offer for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) and by the College.

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

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The Department of Biomedical Engineering will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the Dean/Director or designee consults with the Department Chair (or Chairs in the case of proposed jointly appointed faculty) to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus Dean, Department Chair, department eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires

agreement by the Department Chair and regional campus Dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the Department Chair(s) of all proposed TIU appointments and the regional campus Dean.

3 Practice Faculty

Creation of a practice faculty position requires the prior approval of the Dean. Approved positions must be posted in the University Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources. A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates unless an exception is approved by the Dean. The Department Chair will appoint a search committee and similar procedures for tenure track searches (see above) will be followed. A draft letter of offer to a practice faculty candidate, accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae and appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications, must be submitted to engineering administration for review and approval by the Dean. Engineering administration will review the draft letter of offer for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs and by the College.

Appointments at the rank of associate professor of practice or professor of practice require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. For such appointments, the Dean may consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4 Research Faculty

Creation of a research faculty position requires prior approval of the Dean. Approved positions must be posted in the University Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources. A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates unless an exception is approved by the Dean. Searches generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class. A draft letter of offer to a research faculty candidate, accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae and appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications, must be submitted to engineering administration for review and approval by the Dean. Engineering administration will review the draft letter of offer for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs and by the College.

Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. For such appointments, the Dean may consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5 Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a practice or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the Department Chair, the college Dean, and the executive vice president and provost. All such transfers are subject to the conditions specified in Faculty Rule 3335-7-09 and to the Department of Biomedical Engineering and College limits on the number of practice and research faculty.

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

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

6 Associated Faculty

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

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the department Executive Committee.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

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

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Appointment Criteria above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the Department Chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the Dean's recommendation is negative.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the Department Chair extends an offer of appointment. The Department Chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V Annual Review Procedures

The Department of Biomedical Engineering follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [University Policy on Faculty Annual Review](#).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, creative work and scholarship, and service as set forth in College and Department of Biomedical Engineering guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The annual review of a faculty member is the responsibility of the department chair of the primary TIU. Annual reviews provide a written objective assessment of the candidate's progress in teaching, scholarship and service, a self-evaluation, the Chair's evaluation, and establishment of goals for the coming year. A written draft report is available to faculty at least 24 hours prior to a face-to-face meeting. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the face-to-face meeting is to include the TIU Chairs or Directors and/or designees for all the TIUs to which the faculty member is appointed, while the written evaluation is to be prepared by the primary TIU Chair or Director or designee and signed by all of the TIU Chairs or Directors or designees present at the meeting. Following the meeting, the final written report is made

available to the faculty member, the Dean of the College of Engineering, and the Department Chair/Institute Directors of other departments, Institutes, or Centers in the case of split-appointments.

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

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the Department Chair no later than date shown in Appendix B.

It is the expectation of the College that an annual review of a faculty member conducted by the Department of Biomedical Engineering will have been made consistent with other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources. The Dean must review an annual review when there has been submitted by the Department of Biomedical Engineering: (1) a Report of Non-Renewal of Probationary Appointment of Faculty, (2) the fourth year review of a probationary faculty member, or (3) a Report of Contract Renewal or Non-Renewal for Practice faculty or Research faculty. In each of cases (1), (2) or (3), the decision of the Dean is final. In the case of jointly appointed faculty the annual review will evaluate progress relative to the expectations of each TIU to which the faculty member is appointed.

A Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

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

If the Department Chair of the TIU holding the primary appointment recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this letter should include input from all of the appointed TIUs. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College. The Department Chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

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

1 Regional Campus Faculty

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

case of jointly appointed faculty, these discussions are to include the TIU Chair or Directors or designees for all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed.

2 Fourth-Year Review

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

Annually, the Dean will establish the latest date for the receipt by the College of dossiers from TIUs for candidates undergoing fourth year reviews. The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The department chair, in consultation with the department chairs or School Directors of the secondary appointment TIUs (if applicable), conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department or school review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the Department Chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

A review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee is required unless the Department of Biomedical Engineering Department Chair and Dean agree to reappoint. The fourth year review of a probationary faculty member shall not require the solicitation of external letters of evaluation except when either the Department Chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the Department Chair or School Director of the secondary appointment TIU should be consulted as an additional source of evaluation in determining whether outside letters should be solicited.

The written evaluation from the Department of Biomedical Engineering Chair must clearly provide justification for the recommendation to the College. The Department of Biomedical Engineering Chair must clearly state in the review the expectations of specific achievements in teaching, research or creative work, scholarship and service that the faculty member needs to accomplish before being recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure. For faculty with joint appointments within the college of engineering, this written evaluation should be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed. If the secondary TIU is within the college of engineering, the letter must be signed by the Chairs or Directors of all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed.

3 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

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

B Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

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

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

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

C Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus

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

D Practice Faculty

The annual review process for practice probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty respectively. Performance reviews for practice faculty members will recognize that performance expectations for practice faculty emphasize teaching and curriculum development with scholarly activities related to engineering education and the professional practice of engineering.

For probationary practice faculty, a meeting with the Chair is required to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The Department Chair must prepare a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew if the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty within the college of engineering, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs, and is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College of Engineering.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of a probationary practice faculty appointment, this recommendation is final (see section G below). The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and

goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department Chair letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the Dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

If the position will continue, procedures described in section G below will be followed. The Department of Biomedical Engineering may request additional evidence including from secondary appointment TIUs as applicable to characterize the performance of the faculty member during their contract period. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

E Research Faculty

The annual review process for research probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty.

For probationary research faculty, a meeting with the Chair is required to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The Department Chair must prepare a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew if the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty within the college of engineering this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs, and is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College of Engineering.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department Chair letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the Dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. For

probationary faculty, a 4th year processes will serve as the basis for evaluation while for non-probationary faculty, the normal annual review will serve as the basis for evaluation. The Department of Biomedical Engineering may request additional evidence including from secondary appointment TIUs as applicable to characterize the performance of the faculty member during their contract period. External letters of evaluation may be solicited, but are not required. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

F Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. There is no presumption of reappointment at the end of a contract period. If the position will not continue, the Department Chair should inform the faculty member that there will be a non-renewal of employment.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. Documentation required in the annual review of an associated faculty member will be determined by the Department of Biomedical Engineering. The Department Chair or designee prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The Department Chair recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Department Chair may extend a multiple year appointment subject to the limitations discussed in Section IV.B.6.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or designee. The Department Chair or designee prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The Department Chair recommendation on reappointment is final.

G Special Considerations for Reappointment and Contract Renewal for Practice and Research Faculty

Annual Reappointment for *Probationary Practice and Research Faculty*. The initial appointment of all practice and research faculty is probationary, and as with all probationary faculty, the faculty member must be reappointed each year. Positive decisions by the Department Chair are final. The annual letter must state the outcome of the review, and be forwarded to the college of engineering by *May 15* annually, along with comments from the faculty member, if any.

A recommendation for non-renewal of an annual probationary practice or research appointment requires the approval of both the Department Chair and the college Dean as well as the submission of the [Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointment or Denial of Tenure Form](#). If the faculty member will not be renewed, he or she should be so informed, subject to the relevant standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#).

Appointment Renewal (Contract Renewal) for *Probationary Practice and Research Faculty*. The faculty member must undergo a review no later than the beginning of the penultimate year of his or her contract so the unit may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that faculty member's appointment for a new term. The review will follow the same procedures as for an appointment renewal for tenure track faculty, i.e.: a fourth year review process on the same timeline as tenure track faculty undergoing a fourth year review. The college Dean has the final approval on the reappointment of a probationary practice or research faculty member. Positive decisions will be approved by OAA without a review, and this decision is communicated to OAA using only the [Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form](#) with no attachments. The Board of Trustees (BOT) has final approval, after which the faculty member is no longer probationary. After a recommendation to renew

has been approved, the contract renewal should be completed no later than October 1 in the final year of the contract.

If the faculty member will not be renewed he or she should be so informed, subject to the relevant standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#).

Appointment Renewal (Contract Renewal) for *NonProbationary* Practice and Research Faculty.

Practice and research faculty in their second or subsequent term must be informed as to whether the new appointment will be extended by the *end* of the penultimate year of the contract. An initial decision from the Department Chair to reappoint is final, and the annual review is the basis for this decision. An initial decision not to reappoint requires a review by the eligible faculty or a standing committee of the faculty, as determined by and as set forth by the College of Engineering. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the Dean. After a recommendation to renew has been approved, the contract renewal should be completed no later than *October 1* in the final year of the contract.

Promotion Procedures for Practice and Research Faculty. Practice and research faculty members are eligible for promotion under Rules of the University Faculty. However, they do not undergo mandatory reviews for promotion (just for reappointment and contract renewal). Their promotion review can occur concurrently with contract renewal or on another timeline.

Procedures for promotion of practice and research faculty are substantially similar to those for promotion of candidates on the tenure track. Candidates are subject to full College and OAA review, and complete dossiers following OAA format and standards are required. This includes the requirement that their material be in dossier format. External letters of evaluation are to be collected and included in the dossier for practice and research promotion candidates in the department. The timeline for dossier submission, evaluation and decision notification is identical to that for tenure track candidates and will be distributed before the beginning of the Autumn semester.

VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A Criteria

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

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

The Department of Biomedical Engineering awards merit salary increases consistent with the results of the faculty member's annual review. Meritorious performance in teaching, research, creative work, scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

B Procedures

Each year, the Dean will establish guidelines and notify the Department of Biomedical Engineering Department Chair of the schedule for awarding merit salary increases. Requests for off-cycle salary increases, accompanied by the rationale for the request, must be submitted by the appropriate Department Chair or School Director to the Dean and require Office of Academic Affairs approval.

The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases for faculty with primary TIU appointment in BME and other performance rewards to the Dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries that considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

C Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation be submitted to the Department Chair described below.

- updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Volume 3 (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>)
- updated short biography
- updated summary of teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments
- A summary of accomplishments that includes a summary of scholarship, teaching and service in the preceding calendar year, a follow-up from the previous year's recommendations and goals, and specific plans for the coming year. The summary of accomplishments must include all research and teaching accomplishments, SEI results, and an overall self-evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service and plans for the coming year.

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

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

The time period covered by the documentation described above is the previous calendar year and these documents will generally be due in February or early March (before spring break).

VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A Criteria

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

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

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(E), the Biomedical Engineering department has an APT document that describes (1) the unit's criteria for the award of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, and (2) the unit's criteria for promotion to the rank of professor. In addition, the Biomedical Engineering department has in its APT document the unit's criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor of practice and the unit's criteria for promotion to the rank of professor of practice. The Biomedical Engineering department also has in its APT document the unit's criteria for promotion to the rank of research associate professor and the unit's criteria for promotion to the rank of research professor. This APT document also include the evidence to be provided in support of each of the foregoing actions.

The Biomedical Engineering department has three sets of criteria for promotion and tenure, and for promotion: teaching, scholarship, and service. Evidence of effective contributions in each of these areas must be demonstrated through the documentation of activities over a period of time.

The Biomedical Engineering department comprises a wide array of professional disciplines. Care must be taken to apply the three criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances, superior intellectual attainment and impact, in accordance with the criteria set forth, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured faculty positions. Insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for the maintenance and enhancement of the Biomedical Engineering department and the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge (Faculty Rule 3335-6-02-(D)).

1 Teaching

Teaching is broadly defined to include the imparting of knowledge to and the education of people. The College Mission states that the College and the School will “foster a learning culture that prepares our students to be key contributors to society” and that they will “be an innovative leader in engineering and architectural education.”

Teaching activities include undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses taught in curricular and co-curricular settings; involvement graduate exams, theses, and dissertations; promoting, coaching and mentoring undergraduate researchers; involvement in extension and continuing education; curriculum development; faculty and instructor professional development; evaluation and direction of student scholarship; academic advising; writing textbooks, monographs and other compilations of essential education resources, including online teaching resources; advising of student groups and organizations;

participation in student affairs programs and student services; and engaging in the Scholarship of Teaching (SoTL). Novel teaching methods including development of electronic and other forms of educational interactions with students inside and outside the traditional classroom environment are encouraged.

Evidence of effective teaching can include: student, peer, supervisor and external evaluations of teaching in the classroom; awards and formal recognition for teaching; evaluation of performance as an advisor and mentor; number, level, complexity and size of courses taught, exit interviews with graduating seniors; alumni surveys; quality of textbooks, monographs, electronic resources and other publications on education in the candidate's field; number of completed Masters theses or Ph.D. dissertations; number and quality of undergraduate researchers advised; number and quality of jointly authored publications with graduate or undergraduate students; impact of course and/or curriculum development; and/or effective teaching innovations. The evaluation of a candidate's teaching should be accomplished within a systematic and comparative evaluation process that includes all faculty within the Department of Biomedical Engineering and in other departments in which the candidate has taught.

2 Scholarship

Scholarship is broadly defined to include discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and the scholarship of pedagogy. (Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(A)). More specifically, scholarship may be defined to include the possession, application, and advancement of a body of knowledge gained through research, study, and learning. The College Mission states that the College and the Knowlton School of Architecture will "provide new knowledge that can be assimilated by our customers and partners" and "create and disseminate new ideas and concepts that expand our understanding of science, engineering and architecture."

Scholarly activities will be specific to the Department of Biomedical Engineering or TIUs to which a candidate has been appointed and may include: publishing scholarly works such as books and monographs, chapters in edited books, bulletins and technical reports, peer reviewed journal articles, editor reviewed journal articles, reviews and abstracts, papers in proceedings; presenting lectures at universities, symposia, and conferences; submitting proposals; conducting and directing original research or other creative activities; editing books, and collections of research works; developing software; designing and/or supervising the construction of creative products (e.g., new building, alloy, machine, device, or software); developing and securing intellectual property such as patents, patent disclosures and licensing of university-developed intellectual property.

Evidence of scholarship will be specific to the Department of Biomedical Engineering or TIUs to which a candidate has been appointed and may include the quantity, quality, and impact of the aforementioned activities, for example, numbers of publications and citation analysis thereto in the context of the publishing landscape of Biomedical Engineering, numbers of presentations and invited lectures; amount of research funding in the context of the funding landscape of Biomedical Engineering, number of patents, licenses and licensing revenue, awards, prizes, and other forms of professional recognition; letters of evaluation by peers at the national and international level. For faculty with joint appointments in other college of engineering departments, care must be taken to consider impacts across multiple fields. This is particularly important in cases where the research focus may deviate from what would be considered conventional work for the Department of Biomedical Engineering, and may require evaluations from referees outside of the primary appointment discipline.

3 Service

Service, or public service as stated in the mission of the University, is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university (Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(A)). The College Mission states that the College and the Knowlton School of Architecture will "promote and support the purposes of the entire university."

Evidence of administrative service to the University can include: appointment or election to Department of Biomedical Engineering, College, and/or University committees; administrative positions held and superior organizational leadership; affirmative action and mentoring activities. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include: editorships of or service as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications; offices held and other service to professional societies; development of mechanisms to help bring people into the profession; and organization of and service to conferences, workshops and symposia. Evidence of the provision of expertise to public and private entities beyond the University includes: reviewer of proposals; external examiner; service on panels and commissions; professional consultation to industry, government, and education. Professional expertise provided as a compensated outside professional service alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

The quality and quantity of service and its importance relative to teaching and scholarship is evaluated in the context of the individual faculty member's distribution of effort. For candidates whose duties are mainly administrative in nature, superior administrative service that clearly enhances the effectiveness of the institution may be a primary and leading professional contribution that should be highly valued.

4 Professional Ethics

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, 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.

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

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

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

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

primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

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

Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have provided evidence of *all* of the following criteria:

- Provided up to date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.
- Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm.
- Demonstrated appropriate use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment.
- Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process.
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process.
- Treated students with respect and courtesy.
- Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs.
- Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise.
- Assisted graduate students in the production of high quality published work.
- Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.

In general, each faculty member in Biomedical Engineering is expected to teach courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in consistence with their individual expertise and the needs of the departmental programs. Differences among the different technical areas of the Department, Departmental needs, scheduling matters, enrollment considerations, and other factors are expected to impact the degree of diversity represented in the candidate faculty member's teaching history. Since some of these factors may lie beyond the candidate's control, the candidate's teaching record should exhibit variety subject to these constraints.

The assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the key areas listed above comes primarily from student responses to the eSEI, including the summary of student comments, from peer assessment visits, from materials provided during the BME end-of-term "Course Roundups," and from assessment during the annual reviews (including self-assessment and Chair assessment). (The format for peer assessments in Biomedical Engineering is included in Appendix A.) An analysis of the SEI responses will be done in comparison to the statistics of other faculty in the College of Engineering. Conclusions about teaching effectiveness are based on this comparison as well as the peer assessment and annual reviews.

In addition to the assessment of teaching, the candidate is expected to show evidence of development as an effective mentor of graduate and undergraduate students in research. It is expected that there will be a transient period when the candidate establishes the necessary facilities to support his/her scholarship, establishes his/her identity among graduate students, and attracts student researchers. It is expected that the

candidate would have guided several M.S. students to the completion of their theses, and that he/she would have several Ph.D. students well along in their programs of study. It is also expected that the candidate would be serving, or have served in, a number of thesis/examination committees for graduate students advised by other faculty members, especially in the area of the candidate's research interest, and to have served several times as a Graduate Faculty Representative.

Scholarship

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have provided evidence of *all* of the following criteria:

- Produced coherent body of scholarship that has made a distinct contribution to the discipline, is gaining national or international recognition, and promises continued growth. Scholarship must always find a public venue. Collaborative work and research funding are also encouraged. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - Quality, impact, quantity
 - Unique contribution to a line of inquiry
 - Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination
 - Collaborative work is strongly encouraged, and indeed is essential to most types of inquiry. In this case, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. In the assessment of collaborative work that has led to research productivity, there shall be no evaluative bias against the number of collaborators or co-authors of publications, proposals, projects or other tangible products of the work. Because of the synergism that often results from collaborative work and because of the unique capabilities that individual contributors bring to a team, an assessment of contribution based solely on a linear fractionation of contribution among collaborators can be misleading and inappropriate, and a more holistic assessment that focuses on the candidate's contribution to the success and impact of the work must be made.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain an externally funded research program. This typically requires obtaining multi-year, peer-reviewed federal funding that directly supports the candidate's research program.
- Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is a negative indicator. There shall be no evaluative bias against any particular source of research funding *if it has led to research productivity*.
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, success securing peer-reviewed grants, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.
- Demonstrated a vision for how their individual area of scholarly excellence contributes to advancing the research strategy of the Department of Biomedical Engineering, the college and the university.
- Demonstrated an understanding of how their own areas of scholarly expertise benefit from diversity among faculty, staff and students.
- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in scholarship including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators and in the dissemination of scholarship.

The quality and quantity of scientific publications in refereed archival journals will be considered in the evaluation. The quality of the contribution will be regarded highly, while the quality of the journal will be

considered as a factor. For a variety of reasons, it is difficult to define a specific number of expected archival publications that would be deemed satisfactory. It is both expected and appropriate that the candidate will include publications co-authored with the doctoral advisor. However, some of the archival publications should be authored by the candidate with his/her own research team members, including graduate students. To assess impact, the metric is the quantity and slope of the number of annual citations over time, similar to the annual review in Biomedical Engineering.

It is natural that a transient period will occur as the candidate builds interest in his/her work, acquires and develops graduate student researchers, builds a laboratory, and new collaborations. It is also clear that the significance and duration of such transients is a function of the number of colleagues and the degree of infrastructure in place to support and assist the candidate, according to the research area, upon arrival. Moreover, there is a marked variation in the delay of the peer review process from one journal (or one area) to another. However, once a reasonable period of adjustment is past, the research program of the candidate should begin to produce in a fairly steady manner.

For successful promotion to associate professor with tenure, the Department must be confident that an appropriate scholarly level of performance on the part of the candidate can reasonably be expected to continue. This confidence will derive from such factors as the nature and extent of work in progress, number and status of graduate students under the candidate's direction, funding in place and proposals submitted, and papers accepted and under review. The candidate's own plans for future research directions should also be clear and feasible as documented in the annual reviews including the statement of research/scholarship.

Service

The list of appropriate service activities is provided in VII.A.3.

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

- Made contributions to the governance and advancement of the department/school in a collegial manner that facilitates positive contributions by others, and
- Made useful contributions to the College, the University, industry, and/or civic community.
- Made useful contributions to the profession.

Documentation of growth of these activities is generally documented in the annual reviews, including their assessment (self-assessment and Chair assessment) and should be seen as being at least satisfactory.

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these responsibilities required.

When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another.

In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

Teaching

The general aspects of teaching effectiveness, as well as measures for evaluation, are described previously. For promotion to Professor, the candidate should demonstrate excellence in teaching, as documented by student and peer evaluations. The candidate is expected to have a record commensurate with the duration of his/her employment, with particular emphasis on the period since the last promotion. The candidate is expected to have:

- A record of consistently effective classroom teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses, with particular emphasis on the preceding five years. Measures of quality, which may be used to demonstrate excellence, are the successful use of innovative techniques or third-party evaluations of classroom performance to improve teaching effectiveness, teaching awards for classroom instruction, and variety of courses taught.
- A record of effective mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in research. The candidate shall have graduated several Ph.D. students, and usually, a lesser number of M.S. students. Consistency in the area of mentoring students over the period of interest is important, a steady stream of students being indicative of a continuing and sustained effort. It is also expected that, at the time of consideration for promotion, the candidate will have a number of Ph.D. and M.S. students at various stages of their programs of study.
- A record of significant contributions in the area of curriculum development, in the form of development and/or modifications of courses and labs.
- A record of meaningful and consistent involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor.

The assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the key areas listed above comes primarily from student responses to the eSEI, including the summary of student comments, from peer assessment visits, from materials provided during the BME end-of-term "Course Roundups," and from assessment during the annual reviews (including self-assessment and Chair assessment). (The format for peer assessments in Biomedical Engineering is included in Appendix A.) An analysis of the SEI responses will be done in comparison to the statistics of other faculty in the College of Engineering. Conclusions about teaching effectiveness are based on this comparison as well as the peer assessment and annual reviews.

Scholarship

While general expectations are elaborated upon previously, some aspects specific to promotion to Professor are discussed in this section. The candidate should demonstrate, over the duration of his/her research career, excellence in research/scholarship, as documented by external peer evaluations, the publication record, and funding history. The candidate is expected to have:

- A record of acknowledged excellence in the conduct of scholarly research. The excellence of the candidate's research efforts and scholastic accomplishments must be recognized

nationally and internationally by acknowledged scholars in his/her area. Such a record is usually accompanied by a coherent research program, which has produced important results relating to one or a few central research issues of acknowledged significance in the academic community. Furthermore, consistency of the research effort is important as well, it being highly desirable that the candidate maintain an active research program at the time of consideration for promotion and may include generation of significant intellectual property, filing patents and/or associated commercialization activities.

- A record of consistency and excellence in contributions to the technical literature, especially during the period after the last promotion. The candidate shall have produced a significant body of publications in refereed journals, particularly in high quality archival journals appropriate to the research area, refereed conference proceedings, book chapters and other forms. Other measures of the quality, which may be used, include invited talks and research seminars given by the candidate. It is difficult to place absolute numerical requirements on the publication record, given the wide variability in acceptance rates, prestige and visibility within journals and other publications. However, it is essential that the publication record be commensurate with a sustained record of research, and dissemination of research results, over the duration of the candidate's research career. The publication record in archival journals is of primary importance for promotion to Professor. To assess impact, the metric is the quantity and slope of the number of annual citations over time, similar to the annual review in Biomedical Engineering.
- A record of excellence involving graduate students in research. This aspect of research/scholarship overlaps with the mentoring aspect of the candidate's teaching performance, which has been described previously in the document. In addition to the comments relating to graduation of Ph.D. and M.S. students as part of such mentoring, it is expected that the candidate will have co-authored a number of publications with his/her graduate students, and that he/she will have facilitated research presentations by graduate students at technical conferences. Awards and honors secured by graduate students, such as best paper/presentation awards and university/national fellowships based on research progress and results, reflect positively upon the candidate's involvement of graduate students in research, and will be so treated. Also, honors and fellowships awarded to Ph.D. students after graduation, as well as placement at prestigious institutions, will be similarly treated.
- A record of sustained external funding at a level that can support the research activities of the candidate. Each faculty member is expected to create and maintain an externally supported research program. The funding history of the candidate, including the seeking of the funding, should be consistent with this requirement, especially for the period since the last promotion. This typically requires obtaining multi-year, peer-reviewed funding that directly supports the candidate's research program.
- In addition to demonstrating a record of excellence in the different areas of research/scholarship, the candidate should provide evidence of ongoing research activity in the form of papers in review for publication, continuing grants/contracts, submitted proposals, and Ph.D./M.S. students at different stages in their programs of study.

Service

For promotion to Professor, the candidate faculty member is expected to have compiled a record of effective service, as described below:

- A record of effective service to professional societies, and organizations such as funding agencies, often in leadership roles. Such service may take the form of editorships of prestigious journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings; organization and/or Chairing of sessions at/of technical conferences or workshops; committee Chairmanships in/of societies and federal agency committees; service as reviewer of

proposals for governmental funding agencies; and as reviewer of conference and journal papers.

- A record of effective service to the Department, college, and university, again involving leadership roles. Service in Departmental committees in leadership roles is expected of the candidate. Service to the Department may also take the form of faculty advising of student groups and organizations by the candidate. It is expected and natural that candidates for promotion at this level would have had significantly more opportunities for service to the college and university, and would have availed themselves of such opportunities.
- Included as part of the service to be expected in the department are efforts to foster and lead the dedication, cooperation, professionalism, ethical behavior, and the collegial attitude of the faculty.

Documentation of growth of these activities are generally documented in the annual reviews, including their assessment (self-assessment and Chair assessment) and should be seen as being at least satisfactory.

4 Regional Campus Faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. Recognizing that the character and quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

5 Practice Faculty

All practice faculty must:

- be engaged in teaching, the development of the departmental and College academic program, and the mentoring of students
- contribute to the scholarly mission of the Department of Biomedical Engineering, the College of Engineering, and University
- contribute to service in the Department of Biomedical Engineering, and are strongly encouraged to contribute to service to the College and the University, and at the national level in Biomedical Engineering

The criteria for promotion of practice and research faculty members are distinct from those for tenure track faculty members and from each other. The criteria for practice faculty members primarily emphasize teaching in areas of the curriculum closely linked to professional practice and scholarly activities related to professional practice, whereas those for research faculty members primarily emphasize research and scholarship. The teaching activities of practice faculty must be consistent with the rationale for having practice faculty in the department; these consist of courses that involve the practice of engineering. The scholarly emphasis of practice faculty is expected to be different from that of tenure track and research faculty; practice faculty would be more engaged in activities dealing with the state of the practice of biomedical engineering, while tenure track and research faculty would be more engaged in activities that advance the state of the art and science of biomedical engineering. The venues appropriate for dissemination of such scholarly contributions therefore may be very different from those expected of tenure track faculty. Scholarly and professional service activities of practice faculty would be expected to emphasize outreach and interaction with constituencies beyond the research community, such as with industry, the broader educational community, and the broad community of practitioners. Examples of evidence of contributions in each of these areas are contained in Section VII.A.

Promotion to Assistant Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering. For promotion to assistant professor of in biomedical engineering, a faculty member must complete his/her doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in his or her specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice and service.

Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering. For promotion to associate professor of in biomedical engineering, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate professor of practice are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The candidate should have a record of scholarly activity that contributes to the mission of the department. Scholarship activity should focus on production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

Promotion to Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering. For promotion to professor of practice in biomedical engineering, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

6 Research Faculty

All research faculty must:

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

Classroom teaching is not required of research faculty (Faculty Rule 3335-7-32). However, research faculty members are expected to be engaged in those teaching activities described in Section VII.A that develop the research capabilities of graduate students. The preponderance of the effort of research faculty is expected to be devoted to scholarship activities as described in Section VII.A. Professional service activities such as described in Section VII.A are expected of research faculty, while administrative service activities would be expected to focus on tasks consistent with the candidate's scholarly expertise.

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

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. Subject to the different emphases for research faculty in teaching, scholarship and service described above, the criteria for promotion are similar to those outlined in Section VII.A. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

Promotion to Research Professor. Subject to the different emphases for research faculty in teaching, scholarship and service described above, the criteria for promotion are similar to those outlined in Section VII.A. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

B Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty members in the department.

1 Candidate Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.
- To submit a copy of the APT document under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.
- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

2 Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- Review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the Department Chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the

meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the TIU head.

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this TIU's cases.
- Provide objective assessment of candidates' progress based on information provided by all TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed, taking into consideration any MOU concerning a jointly hired candidate's expectations for performance.
 - Ensure that the AP&T Committee explains and addresses dissenting votes in their report on the candidate, as well as summarizing and addressing all eligible faculty comments.
 - Transmit the completed dossier to Engineering Administration.

3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

4 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- 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.

- **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 Appointments, 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.

The general guidelines, above, are supplemented in Appendix B with more specific suggestions for implementation of the process in Biomedical Engineering.

5 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

The regional campus Dean/Director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the Department Chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

6 External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for practice faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a practice faculty member will be made by the Department Chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an “arms’ length” evaluation of the research record and is not a close

personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

C Documentation

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

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

- Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

1 Teaching

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. Examples of documentation include:

- cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class.
- a year-by-year summary of the eSEI reports (both quantitative and narrative components) prepared by a faculty member other than the candidate.
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including number, provided in Section X below).
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities.
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

2 Scholarship

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is normally the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include:

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

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

3 Service

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is normally the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include:

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

VIII Appeals

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

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

IX Seventh-Year Reviews

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

X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

At the end of each semester, faculty are required to complete the template and attend the "Course Roundup" retreat that includes discussion of the syllabus, areas of concern, ideas for addressing areas of concern, and the outcome of interventions that have been implemented. Further, content appropriate for

ABET assessment and accreditation are discussed, and attention to issues for the overall undergraduate and graduate curricula are discussed.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

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

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

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and practice faculty at least once per year during the first two years of service, and at least twice more during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned
- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary associate professors with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three year period
- To review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary professors with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review
- To review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department Chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Institute for Teaching and Learning (<https://uitl.osu.edu>).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the Department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

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

and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the Department Chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Appendix A: BME Peer Teaching Evaluation Form:

Peer Evaluation of Teaching
Department of Biomedical Engineering

INSTRUCTOR: _____ DATE: _____

COURSE / TOPIC: _____

EVALUATOR: _____

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Good, 3 = Average, 2 = Below Average, 1 = Poor

1. Preparation for lecture

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

2. Objective of the lecture (objectives and student expectations stated clearly)

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

3. Interest, Enthusiasm, Rapport with the Students

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

4. Organization of the lecture material

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

5. Audiovisual, learning materials, handouts

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

6. Observations of Students reactions and interest

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

7. Responsive to student feedback

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

8. Pace and level of the lecture

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

9. Answering questions

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

10. Use of Examples

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

11. Overall quality of the lecture

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Overall Comments:

BME Peer Evaluation of Teaching Materials

Date:

Instructor:

Course Number:

Course Name:

Reviewer Name:

Syllabus review: (see <http://ugeducation.osu.edu/syllabus.shtml>)

- *The Syllabus is a contract - It makes clear what the rules of the class are; it sets forth what is expected to happen during the term of the course; it delineates the responsibilities of students and of the course instructor; and it describes appropriate procedures and course policies.*
- *The Syllabus is a permanent record - It serves accountability and documentation functions related to the course; It contains information useful for evaluation of the instructor(s), course, and program; and it documents what was covered in a course, at what level, and for what kind of credit (useful in course equivalency transfer situations, accreditation procedures, and articulation).*
- *The Syllabus is a learning tool - It helps students become more effective learners in the course; it informs students of the instructor's beliefs about teaching, learning, and the content area; and it places the course in context (how it fits in the curriculum, and how it relates to students' lives).*

1. Prerequisites: Classes, skills, and information required prior to enrolling in course. (Comments)
2. Course Objective: Information to be covered, general themes, and course activities. (Comments)
3. Learning Objectives: A precise statement(s) linking subject matter and student performance. The objective includes competencies, skills, and knowledge students should acquire by the end of the course. Should also include linkage with objectives and accreditation requirements.
(Comments)
4. For BME Domain Classes: Documentation of the “threads” Creativity, hands-on labs, modeling/simulation, technical communication.
(Comments)
5. Textbooks/Readings: Titles, authors, editions, and local book retailers. You should always attempt to order textbooks for which electronic format is available. For information on available alternate format of a book, contact the publisher.
(Comments)
6. Course Schedule: Supply schedule of events; include discussion topics, exam dates, assignments, and readings to be completed for each day.
(Comments)
7. Additional Required Materials: Any additional course material such as calculator or art supplies that the student has to buy to successfully complete the course. Information on such materials needs to be as detailed and specific as possible.
(Comments)
8. Grades: Describe how you are going to calculate the grades and give an explanation of what is required to receive a particular grade.
(Comments)

9. Course Policies: Specify how you deal with tardiness, absences, late assignments, test/assignment make-ups, and academic misconduct. (Does this course use the BME standard syllabus addendum?)
(Comments)

Related Instructional Materials:

1. Comments about handouts, notes, etc.
2. Comments about assignments: homework, quizzes, tests. Do these seem to be assigned at appropriate times during the semester? Level of Difficulty?
3. Comments about the BME Course Roundup Materials (this is for courses that have been completed). Are course objectives being achieved? Does student feedback show that course objectives are being met? Does student feedback demonstrate appropriate mastery of accreditation criteria?
(Comments)
4. Is there continuous quality improvement shown via identification of issues and problems, proposed change or improvements, and effect of teaching in subsequent offerings?
(Comments)

Appendix B: Timeline Guide:

Specific Timeline Guide (to be used as a guideline to help meet specific deadlines).

This is a guideline so there is leeway with the listed dates – except for the dates that affect when materials are delivered to the College. If falling on a weekend, due dates should generally be adjusted to the preceding Friday.

Tenure cases:

By January 15

AP&T Chair reviews prior documentation of teaching performance, checking for completeness

AP&T Chair reviews file, checking to make sure all past annual reviews are available

Assigns two AP&T committee members to review classroom visits and assessments

Evaluative: written critique, using form from AP&T document

Due 5/1 (from candidates)

1 page biography*

3 page summary of scholarship, teaching, service accomplishments and plans*

CV*

3 peer-reviewed, archival papers*

*To be sent to external evaluators

Names of 5 potential evaluators

Updated Dossier, V1

By 5/15:

AP&T committee will generate names for 10 potential evaluators (with input from Department Chair)

AP&T Chair will ask candidate to review the list – the candidate may remove up to 2 names

AP&T Committee and Dept Chair will decide about which, if any, additional regular OSU faculty to ask to serve on the AP&T committee for the coming year

By 6/1:

AP&T Committee will have a final list of 8 external evaluators, no more than 2 from the candidate's list.

AP&T Chair will call and/or e-mail all 8 evaluators asking if they will provide evaluation by 8/1

AP&T Chair will ask candidate for updated CV, if needed, to send to reviewers

By 6/10:

Letter soliciting an evaluation of the candidate is mailed to the 8 evaluators. Letter is signed by Department Chair and AP&T Committee Chair and sent with the 1 page biography, 3-page summary, 3-5 papers, and CV. Due date back from evaluators is 8/1.

By 7/1:

AP&T Chair sends evaluators “gentle reminders” of upcoming due date

8/1:

AP&T Chair begins nagging if there are less than 5 letters in receipt.

8/15:

Final dossier due from the candidate

Initial meeting of AP&T committee with Department Chair
3 meeting times will be scheduled for AP&T meetings
Duties assigned to subcommittees, members appointed:
 Scholarship (including verification of citations)
 Teaching (including SEI, peer review, etc.)
 Service

Committee meetings 1,2, 3 (draft letter)

9/10: (Committee meeting 4)
 Committee vote and letter finalized
 Committee contributions to packet due (including citation verification, SEI, etc.)
 Forms signed by committee members

9/15: Committee letter complete and signed

9/30: Department Chair letter complete and signed
 Committee letter and Department Chair letter available to candidate

10/10: Candidate response, if any, due
 Final committee meeting (5)

10/25: Final packet ready for submission to the Dean's office

4th Year Review cases:

By 11/10

 AP&T Chair reviews prior documentation of teaching performance, checking for completeness
 AP&T Chair reviews file, checking to make sure all past annual reviews are available

Due 12/1 (from candidates)

 1 page biography
 3 page summary of scholarship, teaching, service accomplishments and plans
 SEI (including comments) from all available courses
 CV
 3 peer-reviewed, archival papers
 Updated Dossier, V1

1/8:

 Final dossier due from the candidate

Initial meeting of AP&T committee with Department Chair
4 meeting times will be scheduled for AP&T meetings
Duties assigned to subcommittees, members appointed:
 Scholarship (including verification of citations)
 Teaching (including SEI, peer review, etc.)
 Assigns two committee members to review classroom visits and assessments
 Evaluative: written critique, using form from AP&T document
 Service

Committee meetings 1,2 (draft letter)

2/2: (Committee meeting 3)

Committee vote and letter finalized

Committee contributions to packet due (including citation verification, SEI, etc.)

Forms signed by committee members

2/5: Committee letter complete and signed

2/9: Department Chair letter complete and signed

Committee letter and Department Chair letter available to candidate

2/19: Candidate response, if any, due

Final committee meeting (4)

2/21: Final packet ready for submission to Dean's Office

Annual Review: probationary and tenured faculty members:

The following is for a "standard" annual review. Tenured faculty may also periodically request an evaluation by the professors on the AP&T committee (e.g., prior to promotion, or for seeking a broader perspective on achievements) similar to that for probationary faculty members.

Due 2/1 (from faculty member): Annual Review Materials

1 page biography

3 page summary of research, teaching, service accomplishments and plans

Completed Recent Professional Activities document including completion of all sections.

By 3/31: faculty member one-on-one meeting with Department Chair

By 4/15: Chair letter to faculty member, copied to Dean