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I  Introduction

Purpose
This document provides a brief description of the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering (CEGE), as well as a description of its policies and procedures. It supplements the Rules of the University Faculty and other policies and procedures of the University to which CEGE and its faculty are subject. The latter rules, policies, and procedures, and changes in them, take precedence over statements in this document.

Revision
This Pattern of Administration is subject to continuing revision. It must be reviewed and either revised or reaffirmed on appointment or reappointment of the CEGE Chair. However, revisions may be made at any time as needed. All revisions, as well as periodic reaffirmation, are subject to approval by the OSU College of Engineering office and the OSU Office of Academic Affairs.

Scope
This POA governs all Departmental matters in which the Faculty has power to act. Powers of the Faculty are delegated to committees or otherwise only by this POA. In alignment with the general policies and procedures related to the governance of the College of Engineering, the Department recognizes the presumption favoring faculty rule on those matters in which the Faculty have primary responsibility, including: curricula, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, appointments, promotion and tenure of faculty, faculty governance including departmental faculty meetings, peer mentoring and peer evaluation of teaching, and those aspects of student life related to the educational process.

Interpretation
This POA shall be interpreted consistently with applicable statues of the State of Ohio, the By-Laws of the Board of Trustees, and the Rules of the University faculty. All references to periods of time in days refer to calendar days; in computing a period of time, the date of the act or event from which the period of time begins to run shall not be included.

II  Department Mission

To create and disseminate civil, environmental and geodetic knowledge through innovative research and instruction that is in service to society.

III  Academic Rights and Responsibilities

In April 2006, the university issued a reaffirmation of academic rights, responsibilities, and processes for addressing concerns. This statement can be found on the Office of Academic Affairs website.

IV  Faculty

Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 defines the types of faculty appointments possible at The Ohio State University and the rights and restrictions associated with each type of appointment. For purposes of governance, the Departmental faculty include tenure track faculty, practice (clinical) faculty, and research faculty and
associated faculty with total compensation of at least 50% FTE. In cases where a faculty member holds a joint appointment, governance rights in CEGE extend when the majority of the appointment is assigned to the CEGE Department. Associated faculty with total compensation below 50%, emeritus faculty and tenure-track faculty with a joint appointment with a minority portion assigned to the CEGE Department may be invited to participate in discussions on non-personnel matters, but they may not participate discussion in personnel matters, including appointment, promotion and tenure reviews, and they may not vote on any matter.

**Practice Faculty and Research Faculty Appointment Cap and Governance Rights**

The total practice faculty plus research faculty is capped at 25% of the total tenure track, practice faculty and research faculty in the CEGE Department. Hence, tenure-track faculty would be 75% of the total faculty in the department. Practice faculty and research faculty may vote in all non-personnel matters. The College and CEGE Appointments, Promotion & Tenure (APT) documents detail the participation of practice faculty and research faculty in personnel matters; practice faculty are not permitted to vote in the appointment, promotion or tenure review of tenure track faculty or the appointment, reappointment, or promotion review of research faculty and research faculty are not permitted to vote in the appointment, promotion or tenure review of tenure track faculty or the appointment, reappointment, contract renewal, or promotion review of practice faculty.

**Associated Faculty Governance Rights**

Associated faculty with total compensation at or above 50% are permitted to vote in all non-personnel matters. Under no circumstances may persons with associated faculty titles vote in matters pertaining to tenure-track, practice or research faculty appointment, promotion and tenure decisions.

**Emeritus Faculty Governance Rights**

Emeritus faculty may be invited to participate in discussions on non-personnel matters, but may not participate in discussions about personnel matters, including appointment, promotion and tenure reviews, and may not vote on any matter.

**V Organization of Department Services and Staff**

To run a successful and smooth Department requires the expertise of a support staff made up of Civil Service and Administrative and Professional Personnel to assist the CEGE Chair and faculty on a day-to-day basis.

**A. CEGE Program Assistant**

The CEGE Program Assistant supports department-level business and activities. The responsibilities of the CEGE Program Assistant include:

- provide administrative support to the Department Chair, including scheduling of Chair’s calendar of meetings and maintaining an archive of Chair written communications related to departmental matters
- interface with the College HR, Business and Dean offices to fulfill regular and special requests to/from department that relate to hiring, promotion and tenure, departmental budgets
- schedule regular and special meetings of the department faculty, standing and ad hoc departmental committees
- provide support for the Promotion & Tenure (P&T) committee by reviewing dossiers for completeness, collecting and organizing external review letters at the request of the Department Chair, providing access of eligible faculty to promotion dossiers, delivering P&T documentation to College
- initiate paperwork for faculty searches, files final paperwork for faculty searches, on-boards new faculty, including preparation of assigned office space
- coordinate graduate student desk assignments and key authorizations in consultation with Chair
→ hold responsibility for hiring, on-boarding, training and coordinating the assignments of Student Assistants in the department, including Student Assistant support to Departmental committee or special project requests
→ coordinate departmental annual review process including collection of requested documentation in advance for chair review, scheduling of review meetings and distributing Chair’s letters
→ place purchase requisition requests for department-initiated events and department investments in office and lab infrastructure

B. Academic Advising Staff and Office
The CEGE Academic Advising staff is responsible for supporting undergraduate students though activities that include:
→ support to navigate the Bachelor degree requirements, academic standards and associated processes, course selection and schedule, minors, honors/research/distinction opportunities and graduate opportunities
→ assist with Orientation for new first-year, transfer and international students
→ assist with transfer credit evaluation
→ provide guidance and support to faculty to resolve student issues, including, but not limited to: disruptive students, distressed students, allegations of academic misconduct
→ review applications to majors in Civil Engineering and Environmental Engineering
→ maintain undergraduate student records
→ serve in an advisory capacity to the Undergraduate Studies Committee to provide recommendations and guidance for improving the student experience, based on their interactions with undergraduate students during routine advising duties.
→ submit the departmental room scheduling request to the Registrar prior to the institutional deadlines for Autumn and Spring semesters. The Department Chair, with input from faculty, assigns instructors to courses. The advising staff does not assign instructors to courses.
→ provide support in leadership and professional development of students, including organization the Industry Mentor program, the e-council of CEGE student groups.
→ fulfill duties as defined by College Advising Team
→ interface with College Advising team to recommend and implement guidelines relevant to CEGE Department

C. Graduate Program Coordinator
The CEGE Graduate Program Coordinator provides support to the Graduate Studies Committee with responsibilities that include:
→ serves as academic liaison for graduate students, the CEGE Graduate Studies Chair, the Graduate School and Graduate Admissions, including guidance on academic programs and policies regarding admission, financial support and graduation requirements
→ serves in an advisory capacity to the Graduate Studies Committee to provide recommendations and guidance for improving the graduate student experience
→ supports Graduate Student Council
→ provides administrative support for review of graduate applications, including management of applicant records during the review process and Graduate School notification of applicant decision
→ maintains graduate student records for the department and monitors academic progress of graduate students
→ coordinates graduate student on-boarding and serves as graduate student advocate
coordinates application and training process for GTAs

D. Communications Specialist
The CEGE Communications Specialist is responsible for maintaining Departmental ‘public relations’ with external stakeholders, including alumni and industry with duties that include:
- maintain the CEGE website
- produce photography, videography, social and print media in support of initiatives of CEGE Chair and College Advancement
- support faculty research websites
- publicize Department news and achievements through the College, university and regional communications
- logistic support for CEGE Departmental Advisory Board meetings and special events with external stakeholders
- coordinate invitations and agendas for faculty searches

E. Lab Supervisors
The CEGE Lab Supervisors are responsible for overseeing activities associated with regularly scheduled laboratory courses and providing support to experimental research facilities (chemical or physical) with duties that include:
- teaching lab set-up and oversight of clean-up, including order placement for consumables
- maintain and calibrate instruments used in teaching lab and/or research facilities
- train and supervise undergraduate researchers
- conduct safety training for undergraduate and graduate students
- perform preventative maintenance on FOD supplied utilities, including weekly flush of safety eye wash stations and routine checks of fume hood operation
- manage assets, including asset audits, tagging and retiring of all capital assets, surplus management and pick-up
- coordinate access to CEGE buildings including, delivery of large equipment, hazardous waste pick-up with EHS

F. Building Manager
The CEGE Building Manager (reports to the Associate Dean for Infrastructure) is responsible for the regular function of the physical infrastructure of CEGE buildings, Hitchcock Hall and Bolz Hall, with duties that include:
- advance, and follow-up with OSU Facilities Operations and Development (FOD) regarding, notifications of faulty function of physical infrastructure, including lighting, plumbing, locks and security, fume hoods
- overall cleanliness and hard trash
- coordinate between building occupants and FOD during renovation activities, including work with contractors and project engineers through FOD
G. Student Assistants
The CEGE Department maintains a staff of Student Assistants who are responsible for clerical support to some departmental activities. Duties include:

- answer phones and emails and respond to queries
- distribute mail and ship parcels via UPS
- make copies, scans and faxes
- schedule conference rooms and teleconference lines
- make hotel and dinner reservations
- support Departmental committees with note-taking and typing/transcription, proof-reading, etc;
- activities to be coordinated at least one week in advance with CEGE Program Assistant
- support Departmental faculty with special projects; activities to be coordinated at least one week in advance with CEGE Program Assistant

H. Other Staff
The College of Engineering maintains a centralized business office that provides support for HR and fiscal matters with dedicated personnel assigned to CEGE.

- HR Specialist for matters related to faculty, post-doc and visiting scholars visa status and immigration issues, flexible work arrangements and Family Medical Leave.
- HR Generalist for matters related to graduate student research appointments and undergraduate student hires, hiring of post-doc scholars, coordination of visiting scholars. Visiting scholar appointments must first be approved by the CEGE Department
- Fiscal Officer for purchasing requests originating from faculty-directed fund sources and PCard.
- Fiscal Associate for travel requests originating from faculty-directed fund sources and PCard.
- Engineering Technical Services (ETS) provides support for faculty and staff to resolve IT and university account related issues. ETS service is accessed through the ticket request system.

VI Overview of Department Administration and Decision-Making
Policy and program decisions are made in a number of ways: by the CEGE faculty as a whole, by standing or special committees of the Department, or by the CEGE Chair. The nature and importance of any individual matter determine how it is addressed.

CEGE governance proceeds on the general principle that the higher priority or urgency of the matter to be decided, the more inclusive the participation in decision making is adhered to.

Open discussions, both formal and informal, constitute the primary means of reaching decisions of central importance to CEGE.

A Chair
The primary responsibilities of the Chair are set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-3-35. This rule requires the CEGE Chair to develop, in consultation with the faculty, this Pattern of Administration with specified minimum content. This rule, alongside Faculty Rule 3335-6, also requires the Chair to prepare, in consultation with the faculty, a document setting forth policies and procedures pertinent to promotion and tenure.
Other responsibilities of the CEGE Chair, not specifically noted elsewhere in this Pattern of Administration, are paraphrased and summarized below.

→ To have general administrative responsibility for CEGE programs, subject to the approval of the Dean of the OSU College of Engineering, and to conduct the business of the Department efficiently. This broad responsibility includes the acquisition and management of funds and the hiring and supervision of CEGE faculty and staff.

→ To plan with the members of the faculty and the Dean of the OSU College of Engineering, a progressive program that encourages research and educational investigation.

→ To evaluate and improve instructional and administrative processes on an ongoing basis; to promote improvement of instruction by providing for the evaluation of each course when offered, including written evaluation by students of the course and instructors, and periodic course review by the faculty.

→ To evaluate faculty members annually in accordance with University, College and CEGE established criteria; to inform faculty members when they receive their annual review of their right to review their primary personnel file maintained by their Department and to place in that file a response to any evaluation, comment, or other material contained in the file.

→ To recommend appointments, promotions, dismissals, and matters affecting the tenure of members of the CEGE faculty to the Dean of the College, in accordance with procedures set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6 and the CEGE Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (AP&T) document.

→ To see that all faculty members, regardless of their assigned location, are offered the Departmental privileges and responsibilities appropriate to their rank; and in general to lead in maintaining a high level of morale.

→ To maintain a curriculum vitae for all personnel teaching a course in the Department’s curriculum.

→ To see that adequate supervision and training are given to those members of the faculty and staff who may profit by such assistance.

→ To prepare, in consultation with the faculty, annual budget recommendations for the consideration of the Dean of the College.

Day-to-day responsibility for specific matters may be delegated to others, but the CEGE Chair retains final responsibility and authority for all matters covered by this Pattern of Administration, subject when relevant to the higher decision rights and approval of the Dean of the OSU College of Engineering, the Provost and the OSU Office of Academic Affairs, and the OSU Board of Trustees.

Operational efficiency requires that the CEGE Chair exercise a degree of autonomy in establishing and managing administrative processes. The articulation and achievement of CEGE academic goals, however, is most successful when all faculty members participate in discussing and deciding matters of importance. The CEGE Chair will therefore consult with the faculty on all educational and academic policy issues and will respect the principle of majority rule. When a departure from majority rule is judged to be necessary, the CEGE Chair will explain to the CEGE faculty the reasons for the departure, ideally before action is taken.
B. Other Administrators

1. Associate Chair
The CEGE Chair is supported by an Associate Chair who is appointed by the CEGE Chair. The responsibilities of the CEGE Associate Chair include:

- serve as co-Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee
- serve as faculty representative to College and University in matters of student disciplinary actions related to undergraduate students, e.g. COE ASAP, OSU COAM
- implement teaching assignments in consultation with CEGE Chair, including hiring of part-time lecturers and GTAs and making available the full schedule of instruction to the department in a timely fashion
- coordinate peer review of teaching for all departmental faculty according to the schedule set forth in the CEGE APT document and disseminate review letters to candidates, the P&T committee and the CEGE Chair
- support advising activities, as necessary, in coordination with the Advising Team
- advise CEGE Chair on infrastructure, space and other physical needs of department
- coordinate outreach activities for student recruiting and retention, with particular attention to diversity and inclusion
- Additional responsibilities may be assigned by the CEGE Chair as necessary for issues of department-wide interest and importance that are not appropriate to standing or ad-hoc committees. Examples could include participation in Advancement initiatives.

2. Undergraduate Studies Co-Chairs
The CEGE Undergraduate Studies Co-Chairs responsibilities include:

- setting agenda items for regularly scheduled meetings of the CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee
- coordinating assignments of Undergraduate Studies Committee members to accomplish committee activities as detailed by committee duties
- serving on the CEGE Executive Committee
- coordinating departmental communications to the College or University on matters of undergraduate curriculum or undergraduate student experience

3. Graduate Studies Chair
The CEGE Graduate Studies Co-Chairs responsibilities include:

- setting agenda items for regularly scheduled meetings of the CEGE Graduate Studies Committee
- coordinating assignments of Graduate Studies Committee members to accomplish committee activities as detailed by committee duties
- supports graduate students and graduate student thesis and exam committees in interpretation of CEGE and Grad School policy
- serving as a Department signatory, as indicated on Graduate School student forms
- faculty liaison to Graduate School in matters of admissions, student records
- serving on the CEGE Executive Committee
- serve on the COE Graduate Studies Committee
C Committees

Much of the development and implementation of the department's policies and programs is carried out by standing and ad hoc committees. The chair is an ex officio member of all department committees and may vote as a member on all committees, except the Committee of Eligible Faculty and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Committees serve the roles to investigate, to recommend and/or to take action on aspects of departmental business in a manner that has greater efficiency than the full faculty body. Committees are smaller and organized somewhat more informally, and committees are composed of members that are selected for their competence, expertise and willingness to undertake certain responsibilities. Committees have the agility to undertake thorough analysis of the benefits, risks, and alternatives around guidelines or action items from which they can formulate recommendations and motions to bring to the full faculty. As such, the timely and efficient completion of committee work by agreed upon deadlines is critical to the advancement of the CEGE department mission.

1. Standing Committees

Standing committees are permanent committees that meet regularly to conduct business relevant to the function of the Department. Membership on standing committees may change over time as appointment terms expire.

CEGE standing committee membership allows for effective flow of information so that Department business can be conducted efficiently. The following relationship between CEGE Standing Committees recognizes that proposed actions and decisions arising from one committee may affect other committees as a result of the interconnected nature of undergraduate and graduate instruction, research and scholarship and service within the Department:

- **a. CEGE Executive Committee**

**Charge:** The CEGE Executive Committee serves as a steering committee to provide advisement on matters of importance to the Department.

**Membership:** The CEGE Executive Committee shall consist of the Department Chair (*ex officio*), the chairs of all other CEGE standing committees and up to three at-large members to ensure that the CEGE Executive Committee has representation across rank and departmental subdisciplines.

**Selection Process and Terms of Office:** Members are appointed by the Department Chair for one-year appointments that are renewable up to 3 years.
Duties: To provide timely faculty input on decision-making for requests or policy matters that originate from the College or University, or from departmental committees

→ To allow for coordination among standing committees, and ad-hoc committees if necessary, when charges, actions or other activities of one committee have potential to impact responsibilities of other committees

→ To advise on long-range departmental planning

→ To formulate proposals for presentation to, and consultation with, CEGE faculty as a whole

Committee Chair Selection: The CEGE Chair serves as the committee chair in session of the CEGE Executive Committee. The departmental Program Assistant will record and distribute minutes of all CEGE Executive Committee meetings.

Meeting organization: The CEGE Executive Committee will meet once per month in closed session. Special sessions may be called as necessary to address urgent issues that arise outside of the regular meeting schedule.

b. CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee

Charge: The CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee is responsible for reviewing, recommending, and developing guidelines, documents and actions for all matters related to the students and curricula of the Bachelor degree programs in Civil Engineering and Environmental Engineering.

Membership: Organization: The CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee shall consist of the Associate Department Chair plus a minimum of five other members such that the committee as a whole has equal disciplinary representation for the two Bachelor degree programs of the CEGE Department. A minimum of one member of the CEGE Undergraduate Advising team shall also serve on the CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee as a non-voting member. The Associate Department Chair will Co-Chair the committee and a Co-Chair will be appointed in an area different from the Associate Chair. To facilitate committee function, members of the committee will be organized into two subcommittees as follows:

- **ABET\(^1\) assessment subcommittee:** responsibilities include maintaining program compliance with ABET assessment requirements. This committee will be comprised of four members, with two taking a lead role for each degree program.

- **Course review subcommittee:** responsibilities include providing timely review and oversight on activities pertaining to course approvals. This committee will be comprised of the remaining members not on the ABET assessment subcommittee and will have a designated lead.

Relationships to other committees: Certain members of the CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee have additional roles to facilitate communication of pertinent matters to and from the Undergraduate Studies Committee. These additional roles are: (i) joint membership on the CEGE Graduate Studies Committee, (ii) membership on the COE College Committee on Academic Affairs, (iii) membership on the COE committee on the Core Curriculum Teaching and Learning, (iv) membership on the COE committee on Outcomes Assessment for UG Engineering, and (v) membership on the COE College Honors Committee.

Selection Process and Terms of Office: Members are appointed by the CEGE Chair annually for one-year appointments that are renewable up to 3 years. The CEGE Chair will receive advisement from the Advising Coordinator for the member representing the CEGE Undergraduate Advising team to ensure a balance among committee and advising duties. No more than half of the committee can be appointed as

---

\(^1\) Formerly Accreditation Body for Engineering and Technology
‘new’ members in a given year so as to ensure continuity in the Committee’s work. The CEGE Chair will assign the member who will hold the role of joint membership on the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee. The Undergraduates Studies Committee will provide a recommendation to the CEGE Chair at the end of spring semester each year of committee members who will serve in COE committee roles in the subsequent academic year.

Responsibilities of the CEGE Undergraduate Studies Co-Chairs:

→ Setting agenda items for regularly scheduled meetings of the CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee
→ Coordinating assignments of Undergraduate Studies Committee members to accomplish committee activities as detailed by committee duties
→ Serving on the CEGE Executive Committee
→ Coordinating departmental communications to the College or University on matters of undergraduate curriculum or undergraduate student experience

Responsibilities of the entire CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee:

→ To provide timely faculty input on decision-making for requests or policy matters that pertain to undergraduate teaching, curriculum and advising that originate from the College or University, from departmental committees, or from the CEGE Chair
→ To oversee undergraduate curriculum by implementing changes from annual reviews
→ To provide recommendations on undergraduate transfer credits and substitutions
→ Work with the undergraduate advisors and the College of Engineering to develop criteria for admission to CEGE programs including the review of applicant submissions with additional appointed faculty members (if needed)
→ Work with the undergraduate advisors and the College of Engineering to review CEGE admission to major guidelines and propose changes to the process if deemed necessary
→ To recommend representatives to the COE and University committees responsible for developing and implementing undergraduate guidelines and curricula, including the COE CCAA, Core Curriculum committee, and COE assessment committee. Recommendations must be made annually by the last day of regularly-scheduled Spring semester classes
→ To prepare and submit nomination packages for undergraduate student awards to both internal and external competitions
→ To provide advice to the CEGE Chair on student curriculum and instructional grievances
→ To provide recommendations to the CEGE Chair for the formation of an ad-hoc committee to address undergraduate issues or actions of large scope for which inclusion of additional non-Committee members is important
→ To review and approve the use of a textbook or other materials in a course taught by a faculty member in the case that the textbook or other materials is/are authored by the faculty member and the sale of which results in a royalty being paid to the faculty member
→ To provide a report of activities at least once per semester to the full faculty, or at other times as per the request of the Chair

Responsibilities of the ABET assessment subcommittee:

→ To review and recommend procedures to satisfy ABET requirements, including program educational objectives, student outcomes, and the programs’ continuous improvement process. To annually report findings and recommendations to the Faculty and CEGE Advisory Board
→ To prepare an assessment plan, collect, maintain materials, and document assessment tools used to maintain ABET accredited CEGE programs
Responsibilities of the Course Review Subcommittee:

- Provide oversight and review of new course proposals and course modifications
- Maintain current and accurate catalog descriptions
- To bring motions to the general faculty for modifications of courses and new course proposals and other pertinent initiatives that are recommended as a result of deliberations on undergraduate matters originating from the College, University, other departmental committees, or the CEGE Chair
- To provide recommendations on concurrence from CCAA and other university unit requests

Committee Chair Selection: The CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee will be co-chaired by a representative of the Civil Engineering program and a representative of the Environmental Engineering program. One of the co-chairs will be the Associate Department Chair and the other co-chair will be appointed by the Department Chair.

Meeting organization: The CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee will meet at least once per month.

c. CEGE Graduate Studies Committee

Charge: The CEGE Graduate Studies Committee is responsible for reviewing, recommending, and developing guidelines, documents and actions for all matters related to the students and curricula of the Master and Doctoral degree programs in Civil Engineering.

Membership: The CEGE Graduate Studies Committee shall consist of a minimum of six committee members such that the committee as a whole has balanced disciplinary representation for the major graduate tracks. The Graduate Program Coordinator shall also serve on the Graduate Studies Committee as a non-voting member.

Relationship to other committees: One member of the Graduate Studies Committee will be appointed to the CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee. The CEGE Graduate Studies Chair will serve as the Department’s delegate at College and University committees pertaining to graduate student affairs.

Selection Process and Terms of Office: Members are appointed by the CEGE Chair annually for one-year appointments that are renewable up to 3 years. No more than half of the committee can be appointed as ‘new’ members in a given year so as to ensure continuity in the Committee’s work.

Duties: To provide timely faculty input on decision-making for requests or policy matters that pertain to graduate teaching, curriculum and advising that originate from the College or University, from departmental committees, or from the CEGE Chair

- To oversee graduate curriculum by implementing changes from annual reviews, considering/reviewing new course proposals, and maintaining current and accurate catalog descriptions
- To bring motions to the general faculty for modifications of courses and new course proposals and other pertinent initiatives that are recommended as a result of deliberations on graduate program matters originating from the College, University, other departmental committees, or the CEGE Chair
- To provide recommendations on concurrence from CCAA and other university unit requests
- To review graduate student advisory committee recommendations on graduate transfer credits and substitutions
- To oversee the review of graduate student application admissions to the Civil Engineering graduate programs in a timely manner using consistent and inclusive standards, and to forward recommendations for admittance to the Graduate Program Coordinator
To prepare and submit nomination packages for graduate student awards to both internal and external competitions that recognize academic, outreach and scholarly accomplishments, including graduate applicant nominees for university or college fellowships; preparation of travel award nomination packages are excluded.

To publicize departmental travel award competition windows at least 30 days in advance of the quarterly application deadlines of the 1st day of the months of May, Sept., Nov. and Feb.

To select graduate student travel awardees from on-line applicants for each quarter by the 15th of the months of May, September, November and February.

To monitor graduate student degree progress and provide advisement.

To provide advice to the CEGE Chair on student curriculum and instructional grievances.

To provide recommendations to the CEGE Chair for the formation of an ad-hoc committee to address graduate issues or actions of large scope for which inclusion of additional non-Committee members is important.

To provide a report of activities at least once per semester to the full faculty, or at other times as per the request of the Chair.

Committee Chair Selection: The CEGE Graduate Studies Chair will be appointed by the CEGE Department Chair. The CEGE Graduate Studies Chair will serve as the Department’s delegate at College and University committees pertaining to graduate student affairs.

Meeting organization: The CEGE Undergraduate Studies Committee will meet at least once per month.

d. CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee

Charge: The CEGE Promotion & Tenure Committee is responsible for reviewing mandatory and non-mandatory faculty promotion cases and developing guidance on policies detailed in the CEGE Department APT Document.

Membership: The CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty with rank of professor such that the committee, as a whole, has balanced disciplinary representation of departmental instruction and scholarship. The Committee will designate a Procedures Oversight Designee for each case under review from its membership. Promotion and Tenure Committee membership will be augmented temporarily with additional members only for review of practice faculty and research faculty promotion cases, according to the guidelines detailed in the CEGE APT document.

Selection Process and Terms of Office: Members are appointed by the CEGE Chair for three-year appointments that are renewable. Appointments will be staggered to the greatest extent possible, considering leaves, administrative appointments and other factors that may impact the availability of eligible tenured professors.

Duties: To follow all procedures as detailed in the CEGE Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) document.

To check dossiers prepared by candidates for completeness and accuracy, including inclusion of the minimum number of peer reviews of teaching, and to request additional clarification and corrections by candidates to ensure compliance with University standards.

To review dossiers prepared by candidates for promotion, promotion and tenure, and fourth-year review, and to prepare for the Committee of Eligible Faculty a detailed quantitative and qualitative...
evaluation of the candidate in terms of his/her own field and role in the Department, revising this
evaluation, if necessary, to reflect the final vote of the Eligible Faculty.

→ To perform an annual review of the University and College of Engineering promotion and tenure
criteria and procedures to ensure that Department policies are in compliance

→ To formulate and recommend revisions to the CEGE Promotion and Tenure procedures and criteria to
the Faculty where appropriate and necessary

→ To provide annually to faculty, an overview of the Promotion and Tenure review processes with
discussion of the criteria for promotion to various ranks

→ To evaluate Special Assignment requests and make recommendations to the CEGE Chair

→ To review requests for Faculty Professional Leave and make recommendations to the Chair

**Committee Chair Selection:** The CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair will be appointed by
the CEGE Department Chair.

**Meeting organization:** The CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet in closed session as
necessary to meet the College deadlines for dossier review. Membership will be augmented as detailed in
the APT document for review of Practice Faculty and Research Faculty cases.

e. CEGE Mentoring Committee

**Charge:** The CEGE Mentoring Committee is responsible for recommending, developing and reviewing
activities to support the professional development of faculty in the CEGE department with the particular
goal to assist in situating for successful promotion those with ‘Assistant’ and ‘Associate’ titles.

**Membership:** The CEGE Mentoring Committee shall consist of a minimum of four tenure-track
professors such that the committee, as a whole, has balanced disciplinary representation of departmental
instruction, scholarship and rank. At least one member of the CEGE Mentoring Committee will be a
current member, or an immediate past member, of the CEGE or COE Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Selection Process and Terms of Office:** Members are appointed by the CEGE Chair for one-year
appointments that are renewable up to three years.

**Duties:**

→ To organize a program of group- and peer-mentoring activities to support assistant- and
associate-rank professor success. Individual mentors will be assigned by the CEGE Chair.

→ To coordinate, at least annually, a meeting with member(s) of the CEGE Promotion and Tenure
committee to review promotion and tenure procedures and expectations

→ To review annually the status and success of the mentoring program, including the contribution of
individual mentoring, and to provide a report to the CEGE Chair

→ To serve as a clearinghouse for information related to mentoring best practices

→ To provide a report of activities at least once per semester to the full faculty, or at other times as per
the request of the Chair

**Committee Chair Selection:** The CEGE Mentor Committee Chair will be appointed by the CEGE
Department Chair.

**Mentoring Program:** Details of the mentoring program are included as Appendix I to the CEGE POA.
f. CEGE Awards Committee

Duties: To organize a program of group- and peer-mentoring activities to support assistant- and associate-rank professor success. Individual mentors will be assigned by the CEGE Chair.

To prepare and submit nomination packages for faculty and staff awards to both internal and external competitions.

Selection Process and Terms of Office: Members are appointed by the CEGE Chair for three-year appointments that are renewable.

2. Ad-Hoc Committees

In addition to the standing committees, the faculty may from time to time form and serve on ad-hoc committees through the initiative of the CEGE Chair in coordination with the faculty. Approval of an ad-hoc committee must be sought through a vote of the CEGE faculty. The need for an existing ad-hoc committee will be reviewed annually during the development of the annual CEGE committee assignments. An ad-hoc committee in existence for more than three years must be disbanded, reauthorized, or made a permanent standing committee by CEGE faculty vote.

3. Individual Assignments

The CEGE Chair may appoint individuals to special individual assignments. Examples are CEGE representative to: College Promotion and Tenure Committee, College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs; College of Engineering Committee on Outcomes Assessment for Undergraduate Engineering Programs; College of Engineering Core Curriculum and Undergraduate Services Committee; and other similar assignments. Examples within CEGE include faculty search committees, faculty contacts for student organizations, student project competitions, Undergraduate Honors Program, professional society student chapters, undergraduate program technical advisors, and others.

4. Other Related Groups

a. Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Graduate Student Association

The Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Graduate Student Association (CEGA) is a student organization formed with the goal of promoting the professional and social development of the graduate student community in the CEGE Department. A portion of the CEGA mission is to serve as an advocate for issues of importance to graduate students. The CEGE department provides support for CEGA through the Graduate Program Coordinator who can help with event organization (advertising, room reservations, etc.) and through some financial support. CEGA is registered as a Student Organization with the OSU Office of Student Life and follows the constitution created to be achieve ‘Student Organization’ status at the University.

b. Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Department Advisory Board

The CEGE Department engages an Advisory Board composed of distinguished leaders of business, industry, government, non-government and academic organizations. The CEGE Advisory Board provides support to ensuring an exceptional and robust engineering education at all levels by sharing feedback, recommending departmental strategy and offering opportunities for student and faculty engagement. The CEGE Advisory Board is governed by their own ByLaws.
VI. Faculty Meetings

A. Schedule

The CEGE Chair will provide to the faculty a schedule of Department faculty meetings at the beginning of each academic term. The schedule will provide for at least one meeting per academic term and normally will provide for monthly meetings. A meeting of the Department faculty will also be scheduled on written request of 25% of the CEGE faculty. The CEGE Chair will make reasonable efforts to have the meeting take place within one week of receipt of the request.

B. Agenda

A call for agenda items and completed agenda will be delivered to faculty by e-mail before a scheduled meeting. Reasonable efforts will be made to call for agenda items at least seven days before the meeting, and to distribute the agenda by e-mail at least three business days before the meeting. All motions to be brought to a faculty meeting from committees will be stated in the agenda and accompanied with supporting documentation for faculty to review prior to the faculty meeting.

C. Business and Voting

1. Quorum – Non-personnel Matters: For purposes of discussing Department business other than personnel matters, and for making decisions where consensus is possible and a reasonable basis for action, a quorum will be defined as a simple majority of all CEGE faculty members eligible to vote.

2. Quorum – Personnel Matters: Special policies pertain to quorum and voting on personnel matters, and these are set forth in the CEGE Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (AP&T) document.

3. Voting: The CEGE Chair or one-third of all faculty members eligible to vote may determine that a formal vote conducted by written ballot is necessary on matters of special importance. For purposes of a formal vote, a matter will be considered decided when a particular position is supported by at least a majority of all faculty members eligible to vote. Balloting will be conducted by mail or e-mail when necessary to assure maximum participation in voting. When conducting a ballot by mail or email, faculty members will be given one week to respond.

When a matter must be decided and a simple majority of all CEGE faculty members eligible to vote cannot be achieved on behalf of any position, the CEGE Chair will necessarily make the final decision.

4. Inclusive Participation: The Department accepts the fundamental importance of full and free discussion, but also recognizes that such discussion can only be achieved in an atmosphere of mutual respect and civility. Normally, Department meetings will be conducted with no more formality than is needed to attain the goals of full and free discussion and the orderly conduct of business. However, *Keesey's Modern Parliamentary Procedure* will be invoked when more formality is needed to serve these goals.

D. Faculty Meeting Minutes

Faculty meeting minutes will be made available within 48 hours following the start of the faculty meeting. An email will announce that draft copy of the minutes are posted to the CEGE Shared Drive and open for corrections until 7 days following the date of the faculty meeting. Corrections should be addressed to the meeting Secretary, usually the CEGE Program Assistant. Faculty will be notified when final meeting minutes are available to review. Meeting minutes will be accepted by group consent at the following faculty meeting.
E. Significant Changes in Departmental Guidelines

Periodically, recommendations for major changes in guideline documents may originate from a Committee, the Department Chair, or another institutional body. A ‘major’ change is defined as more than five continuous lines of text, or more than five individual lines of text distributed through a guidelines document. Major guideline changes should be introduced and evaluated in a phased approach that balances the necessity of thoughtful faculty input while recognizing time constraints of a regular faculty meeting. These procedural steps follow:

(i) Guideline change is introduced at a faculty meeting by the originator who introduces the broad goals and rationale for guideline change with highlights of the substantive nature of the changes. A brief high-level discussion is appropriate; detailed editing will not be undertaken. A copy of the revised guideline should be distributed in advance, if possible.

(ii) An edited version of the guideline will be posted to the CEGE Shared Teams drive for a minimum of one calendar week for commentary. The posted guideline should have the format of a pdf file with line numbers, strikethrough text for deleted sections, colored font for text additions and review note annotations as appropriate to provide extra rationale or queries. A separate document should be posted for comments to be provided.

(iii) The guideline originator will collate the comments and assess whether any substantive issues are raised that require further consensus discussion. If this is the case, the process will repeat from the first step.

(iv) When a final version of the revised guideline has been developed, it will be posted to the CEGE Shared Teams drive for a minimum of two business days before a motion for a vote is introduced at a full faculty meeting.

VIII Distribution of Faculty Duties and Responsibilities

The Office of Academic Affairs requires departments to have guidelines on the distribution of faculty duties and responsibilities (See the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook, Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 1.4.3. The information provided below supplements these guidelines.

During on-duty academic terms, faculty members are expected to be available for interaction with students, service responsibilities and other responsibilities even if they have no formal course assignment during a term. Expected office hours for each faculty member are a minimum of 1 hr/wk per course on an academic term basis. On-duty faculty members should not be away from campus for extended periods of time unless on an approved Faculty Professional Leave or other approved leaves.

The guidelines outlined here do not constitute a contractual obligation. Fluctuations in the demands and resources of the department and individual circumstances of faculty members may warrant temporary deviations from these guidelines. Assignments and expectations for the upcoming year are addressed as part of the annual review by the CEGE Chair.

A full-time faculty member’s primary professional commitment is to Ohio State University and the guidelines below are based on that commitment. Faculty who have professional commitments outside of Ohio State during on-duty periods (including teaching at another institution, conducting research for an entity outside of Ohio State, or for external consulting) must disclose and discuss these with the CEGE Chair in order to ensure that no conflict of commitment exists. Information on faculty conflicts of commitment is presented in the OAA Faculty Conflict of Commitment Policy.
A. Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the university’s mission via teaching, scholarship and service. When a faculty member’s contributions decrease in one of these three areas, additional activity in one or both of the other areas is expected.

Teaching

All tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute to the department’s teaching, including large enrollment and specialized courses in both the undergraduate and graduate curriculums. The standard teaching assignment for full-time tenure-track faculty members is detailed in Appendix II. Faculty members are also expected to advise graduate students, supervise independent studies and thesis and dissertation work.

Adjustments to the standard teaching assignment may be made to account for teaching a new course, the size of the course, whether the course is taught on-line or team-taught, and other factors that may affect the preparation time involved in teaching the assignment.

The standard teaching assignment may vary for individual faculty members based on their research and/or service activity. Faculty members who are especially active in research may have a reduced teaching assignment. Likewise, faculty members who are relatively inactive in research may have an increased teaching assignment. Faculty members who are engaged in extraordinary service activities may have a reduced teaching assignment.

The Chair is responsible for making teaching assignments on an annual basis, and may decline to approve requests for adjustments when approval of such requests is not judged to be in the best interests of the Department. All faculty must perform some formal instruction and advising over the course of the academic year.

Scholarship

All tenure-track faculty are expected to engage in discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and/or the scholarship of pedagogy, as defined in the APT document. Faculty engaged in basic or applied research are expected to attract extramural funding that supports their efforts. Faculty members are also expected to seek appropriate opportunities to obtain patents and to engage in other commercial or entrepreneurial activities stemming from their research, as appropriate.

Service

Faculty members are expect to be engaged in service and outreach to the university, profession and community. All faculty members are expected to attend and to participate in faculty meetings, faculty and student recruitment activities, and other Department and College events.

1. Guidelines on Faculty Workload

General

Assignment of teaching and workload responsibilities to each faculty member is the responsibility of the CEGE Chair. In meeting this responsibility, first priority for course assignment will be to meet the degree requirements for undergraduate and graduate students.
Timing of Teaching Assignment

By June 30 of each year, the CEGE Chair will have identified courses required to be taught in the following academic year, and will have assigned teaching responsibilities to each faculty member. The required number of course sections, support personnel and facilities, and time of offering shall also have been determined. It is understood that the CEGE Chair may find it necessary to modify these assignments as the academic year progresses, based upon instructional demands and individual circumstances.

Expected Workload

All tenured and tenure track faculty are expected to teach graduate and undergraduate courses, conduct research and perform services at the department, college and/or university levels in addition to professional society services. Expected distribution among these three components is as follows:

- Service: 10% of FTE
- Research: 40% of FTE
- Teaching: 50% of FTE

Detailed expectations of each component as well as policies regarding the redistribution of this workload for deficiencies in the service and/or research components are outlined in Appendix II.

Special Assignments

Information on special assignments (SAs) is presented in the Office of Academic Affairs Special Assignment Policy. The information provided below supplements these policies.

Reasonable efforts will be made to award SA opportunities to all productive faculty members on a rotating basis subject to the quality of faculty proposals, including their potential benefit to the department or university, and the need to assure that sufficient faculty are always present to carry out department work. The department’s committee on Promotion and Tenure will evaluate all SA proposals and make recommendations to the chair. The chair’s recommendation to the dean regarding an SA proposal will be based on the quality of the proposal and its potential benefit to the department or university and to the faculty member as well as the ability of the department to accommodate the SA at the time requested.

B. Practice Faculty

Practice faculty (clinical faculty members) are expected to contribute to the university’s mission through teaching and service, and to a lesser extent through scholarly and creative works. Service expectations are similar to those for tenure-track faculty. All Practice faculty are expected to contribute to teaching of courses, or instructional situations involving professional skills.

C. Research Faculty

Research faculty members are expected to contribute to the university’s mission through research. In accord with Faculty Rule 3335-7-34,
a research faculty may, but is not required to, participate in limited educational activities in the area of his or her expertise. However, teaching opportunities for each research faculty member must be approved by a majority vote of the TIU’s tenure-track faculty. Under no circumstances may a member of the research faculty be continuously engaged over an extended period of time in the same instructional activities as tenure-track faculty.

Research expectations are similar to those for tenure-track faculty, albeit proportionally greater since the majority of effort for research faculty members is devoted to research.

D. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members are expected to contribute to the university’s mission via teaching or research depending on the terms of their individual appointments. Faculty members with tenure-track titles and appointments < 50% FTE will have reduced expectations based on their appointment level. Expectations for compensated visiting faculty will be based on the terms of their appointment and are comparable to that of tenure-track faculty members except that service is not normally required. The University standard for a lecturer full-time teaching load is 8 courses per year.

E. Modification of Duties

Faculty may request a modification of duties from the College of Engineering to allow faculty the flexibility to meet work responsibilities associated with birth or adoption of a child; care for an immediate family member who has a serious health condition, or a qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the faculty member’s immediate family member is on covered active duty in a foreign country or call to covered active duty status. The Department Chair will work with the faculty member to identify a modification plan that is fair to both the faculty member and addressing Department needs. Expectations must be spelled out in an MOU that is approved by the Dean.

IX Course Offerings and Teaching Schedule

The CEGE Chair will annually develop a schedule of course offerings and teaching schedules in consultation with the faculty, both collectively and individually. While every effort will be made to accommodate the individual preferences of faculty, the Department's first obligation is to offer the courses needed by students at times most likely to meet student needs. To assure classroom availability reasonable efforts must be made to distribute course offerings across the day and week. To meet student needs reasonable efforts must be made to assure that course offerings match student demand and that timing conflicts with other courses students are known to take in tandem are avoided. A scheduled course that does not attract the minimum number of students required by Faculty Rule 3335-8-16 will normally be cancelled and the faculty member scheduled to teach that course will be assigned to another course for that or a subsequent semester. Finally, to the extent possible, courses required in any curriculum or courses with routinely high demand will be taught by at least two faculty members across semesters of offering to assure that instructional expertise is always available for such courses.

For the Department to make classroom requests that meet the needs of instructors in a timely manner, the timeline for instructional assignments for the following academic year will progress as follows using calendar dates from the current academic year:

Sept. 15 Request faculty groups submit preferred teaching assignments for subsequent AY, including courses ‘not offered’, special room requests, ID potential adjuncts if needed
Oct. 15 Faculty groups submit preferred teaching assignments to department for review
Oct. 31 Department review of proposed teaching assignments completed and sent to faculty groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1 – Nov 15</td>
<td>Meet with faculty groups to finalize teaching assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 15 – Nov 30</td>
<td>Enter Autumn teaching assignments into system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1</td>
<td>Faculty complete review of Autumn teaching assignments on pulled schedule report; issues sent to Associate Chair for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 15</td>
<td>Submit final Autumn teaching assignments to Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 15 – Jul 1</td>
<td>Enter Spring assignments into system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1</td>
<td>Faculty complete review of Spring teaching assignments on pulled schedule report; issues sent to Associate Chair for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 15</td>
<td>Submit final Spring teaching assignments to Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note that it is critical for the CEGE Chair to be notified by Sept. 15 of intent to apply for Faculty Professional Leave (see Section IX.D below) in the following academic year to allow for appropriate accommodations in instructional assignments. FPL applications that were not prefaced with a notification of intent will be denied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable effort will be made to cancel courses with sufficient notice to allow for reassignment of teaching duties. Dec. 1 will be the review date for Spring semester courses; Jul. 1 will be the review date for Autumn semester courses. The threshold for course cancellations are: (i) fixed at 15 students for undergraduate courses or primarily undergraduate 5000-level courses; (ii) fixed at 5 students for graduate courses, and (iii) subject to review for graduate courses with 6 – 9 students which may result in cancellation, after consideration of past enrollments and scheduled offerings and the existence of other departmental teaching needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures to allocate teaching support for classes through undergraduate graders and graduate teaching assistants are detailed in Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Allocation of Department Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The CEGE Chair is responsible for the fiscal and academic health of the Department and for assuring that all resources – fiscal, human, and physical – are allocated in a manner that will optimize achievement of Department goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The CEGE Chair will discuss the CEGE budget at least annually with the faculty and attempt to achieve consensus regarding the use of funds across general categories. However, final decisions on budgetary matters rest with the CEGE Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research space shall be allocated on the basis of research productivity, including external funding and will be reallocated periodically as these faculty-specific variables change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The allocation of office space will include considerations such as achieving proximity of faculty in sub-disciplines and productivity and grouping staff functions to maximize efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The allocation of salary funds is discussed in the CEGE Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (AP&amp;T) document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Leaves and Absences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University's policies with respect to leaves and absences are set forth in the OSU Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook and Office of Human Resources Policies and Forms website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The information below supplements these policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Discretionary Absence

Faculty are expected to complete a travel request or an Application for Leave form well in advance of a planned absence (e.g., for attendance at a professional meeting or to engage in consulting) to provide time for its consideration and approval and time to assure that instructional and other commitments are covered. Discretionary absence from duty is not a right and the CEGE Chair retains the authority to disapprove a proposed absence when it will interfere with instructional or other comparable commitments. Such an occurrence is most likely when the number of absences in a particular quarter is substantial. Rules of the University Faculty require that the Office of Academic Affairs approve any discretionary absence longer than 10 continuous business days (See Faculty Rule 3335-5-08) and that such a leave must be requested through an absence form available here.

B Absence for Medical Reasons

When absences for medical reasons are anticipated, faculty members are expected to complete an Application for Leave form as early as possible. When such absences are unexpected, the faculty member, or someone speaking for the faculty member, should let the CEGE Chair know promptly so that instructional and other commitments can be managed. Faculty members are always expected to use sick leave for any absence covered by sick leave (personal illness, illness of family members, medical appointments). Sick leave is a benefit to be used – not banked. See OHR Policy 6.27 for details.

C Unpaid Leaves of Absence

The university's policies with respect to unpaid leaves of absence and entrepreneurial leaves of absence are set forth in OHR Policy 6.45. The information provided below supplements these policies.

A faculty member may request an unpaid leave of absence for personal or professional reasons. Professional reasons would include an opportunity to accept a visiting appointment at another institution. A faculty member desiring an unpaid leave of absence should submit a written request for the absence as far in advance as possible of the time for which the leave is desired. Approval will be based on, but not limited to, the nature of the request, the extent to which the faculty member's responsibilities can be covered or deferred during the proposed absence, and the positive or negative impact on the Department of the proposed absence. Unpaid leaves of absence require the approval of the Dean, OSU Office of Academic Affairs, and OSU Board of Trustees.

D Faculty Professional Leave

Information on faculty professional leaves is presented in the OAA Policy on Faculty Professional Leave. The information provided below supplements these policies.

A Faculty Professional Leave (FPL) constitutes a more formal departure from regular academic duties than a Special Research Assignment and may be one or more academic terms up to one academic year. FPLs involve salary reductions and other considerations established by the Ohio legislature and OSU Board of Trustees. Faculty considering an FPL should fully acquaint themselves with these policies before applying for leave.

Faculty members who desire an FPL should discuss the matter with the CEGE Chair during their annual evaluation or as soon thereafter as possible and before Sept. 15 of the calendar year preceding the academic year in which leave will be requested. The CEGE Chair will indicate whether submission of a full proposal articulating the purpose and nature of the FPL is appropriate. Because FPL proposals must be approved by the Dean of the OSU College of Engineering, OSU Office of Academic Affairs, and OSU Board of Trustees before they may be implemented, faculty should submit FPL proposals for a particular
year no later than the end of Autumn term of the preceding year, except when the development of an unexpected opportunity precludes such timing.

The Department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee will review all requests for faculty professional leave and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. Requests should follow the form provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. The application should provide the committee with (i) clear indication of the activity to be undertaken during the leave, (ii) insight into the motivation for the leave, and (iii) the expected outputs and outcomes to be realized from the leave experience, and (iv) letters of invitation or support from sponsors of the planned leave activity. The CEGE Executive Committee will assess applications based on the degree to which the proposed activity enhances teaching effectiveness, scholarly interests or overall professional development; strengthens and develops the department’s mission; and realistically achieves the applicant’s goals during the period requested.

Highest priority in the review process will be given to those applicants who have a positive record of achievement, service, and commitment to the department and can show the benefits of the requested leave to their continuing professional development and the Department.

The CEGE Chair's recommendation to the Dean of the OSU College of Engineering regarding an FPL proposal will be based on the quality of the proposal and its potential benefit to CEGE and to the faculty member, as well as the ability of CEGE to accommodate the leave at the time requested.

E  Parental Leave

The university, the college, and this department recognize the importance of parental leave to faculty members. Details are provided in the OHR Parental Care Guidebook, Paid Leaves Program Policy 6.27, and the Family and Medical Leave Policy 6.05.

XI1  Supplemental Compensation and Paid External Consulting

Information on faculty supplemental compensation is presented in the OAA Policy on Faculty Compensation. Information on paid external consulting is presented in the university’s Policy on Faculty Paid External Consulting. The information provided below supplements these policies.

CEGE adheres to these policies in every respect. In particular, the Department expects faculty members to carry out the duties associated with their primary appointment with the University at a high level of competence before seeking other income-enhancing opportunities.

All activities providing supplemental compensation must be approved by the CEGE Chair and College Dean regardless of the source of compensation. External consulting must also be approved. Approval will be contingent on the extent to which a faculty member is carrying out regular duties at an acceptable level, the extent to which the extra income activity appears likely to interfere with regular duties, and the academic value of the proposed consulting activity to the Department. In addition, it is University policy that faculty may not spend more than one business day per week on supplemental compensated activities and external consulting combined.

Faculty who fail to adhere to the University's policies on these matters, including seeking approval for external consulting, will be subject to disciplinary action.

Faculty with an administrative position (for example, chair, associate/assistant dean, center director) remain subject to the Policy on Faculty Paid External Consulting and with appropriate approval, are permitted to engage in paid external work activities. However, faculty members with administrative
positions are not permitted to accept compensation/honoraria for services that relate to or are the result of their administrative duties and responsibilities.

Should a departmental faculty member wish to use a textbook or other material that is authored by the faculty member and the sale of which results in a royalty being paid to him or her, such textbook or material may be required for a course by the faculty member only if the CEGE Executive Committee an appropriate departmental or college committee reviews and approves the use of the textbook or material for use in the course taught by the faculty member.

XIII Financial Conflicts of Interest

Information on faculty conflict of interest is presented in the university’s Policy on Faculty Financial Conflict of Interest. A conflict of interest exists if financial interests or other opportunities for tangible personal benefit may exert a substantial and improper influence upon a faculty member or administrator's professional judgment in exercising any university duty or responsibility, including designing, conducting or reporting research.

Faculty members with external funding, or otherwise required by university policy, are required to file conflict of interest screening forms annually and more often if prospective new activities pose the possibility of financial conflicts of interest. Faculty who fail to file such forms or to cooperate with university officials in the avoidance or management of potential conflicts will be subject to disciplinary action.

In addition to financial conflicts of interest, faculty must disclose any conflicts of commitment that arise in relation to consulting or other work done for external entities.

XIV Grievance Procedures

Members of the Department with grievances should discuss them with the CEGE Chair who will review the matter as appropriate and either seek resolution or explain why resolution is not possible. Content below describes procedures for the review of specific types of complaints and grievances

A Salary Grievances

A faculty or staff member who believes that his or her salary is inappropriately low should discuss the matter with the CEGE Chair. The faculty or staff member should provide documentation to support the complaint.

Faculty members who are not satisfied with the outcome of the discussion with the chair and wish to pursue the matter may be eligible to file a more formal salary appeal (the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook).

Staff members who are not satisfied with the outcome of the discussion with the CEGE Chair and wish to pursue the matter should contact Employee and Labor Relations in the OSU Office of Human Resources.

B Faculty Misconduct

Complaints alleging faculty misconduct or incompetence should follow the procedures set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-5-04.
C  Faculty Promotion and Tenure Appeals

Promotion and tenure appeals procedures are set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

D  Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct

The Office of Institutional Equity exists to help the Ohio State community prevent and respond to all forms of harassment, discrimination, and sexual misconduct.

Ohio State’s policy and procedures related to affirmative action, equal employment opportunity, and non-discrimination/harassment are set forth in university Policy 1.10.

The university's policy and procedures related to sexual misconduct are set forth in OHR Policy 1.15.

E  Violations of Laws, Rules, Regulations, or Policies

Concerns about violations of laws, rules, regulations, or policies affecting the university community should be referred to the Office of University Compliance and Integrity. Concerns may also be registered anonymously through the Anonymous Reporting Line.

F  Student Complaints

Normally student complaints about courses, grades, and related matters are brought to the attention of individual faculty members. In receiving such complaints, faculty should treat students with respect regardless of the apparent merit of the complaint and provide a considered response. When students bring complaints about courses and instructors to the CEGE Chair, the CEGE Chair will first ascertain whether the students require confidentiality or not. If confidentiality is not required, the CEGE Chair will investigate the matter as fully and fairly as possible and provide a response to both the students and any affected faculty. If confidentiality is required, the CEGE Chair will explain that it is not possible to fully investigate a complaint in such circumstances and will advise the student(s) on options to pursue without prejudice as to whether the complaint is valid or not. See Faculty Rule 3335-8-23.

Faculty complaints regarding students must always be handled strictly in accordance with University rules and policies. Faculty should seek the advice and assistance of the CEGE Chair and others with appropriate knowledge of policies and procedures when problematic situations arise. In particular, evidence of academic misconduct must be brought to the attention of the Committee on Academic Misconduct (see Faculty Rule 3335-23-05).

G  Academic Misconduct

In accordance with the Code of Student Conduct, faculty members will report any instances of academic misconduct to the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

H  Professional Student Honor Code

The department has an academic standard and requirements guidelines that is explained in the Graduate Studies Program handbook. Students must also comply with the Graduate School’s professional standards of academic, research, and scholarly conduct, and the University’s Code of Student Conduct.
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Faculty Mentoring Program
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Goal and Objectives

The goal of the Faculty Mentoring Program in the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering is to support faculty to reach their full potential as scholars, teachers and members of professional and institutional communities, as they move through rank at OSU.

This goal will be achieved by building a strong community of early-career faculty and mentors who are collectively engaged in faculty development with a two-fold objective for open communication:

1. To promote the successes of faculty in scholarship, teaching and service activities, and
2. To develop effective strategies and tools for early-career faculty to surmount difficulties, challenges and pitfalls on the pathway to reaching their full potential as faculty members.

Philosophy

The departmental Faculty Mentoring Program is grounded in transparency of the faculty promotion process. Early career faculty can most effectively advance on a pathway of success through faculty rank when they feel embraced and cherished and supported in the department, and when they are knowledgeable of the process by which promotion evaluations are made. Such knowledge is advanced beyond the detailed OSU, COE and CEGE institutional expectations (as described in the relevant Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures (APT) documents) to highlight how external letter writers and Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committees evaluate individual dossiers within the context of APT expectations.

This philosophy informed the organization of the Faculty Mentoring Program and the choices of resources and strategies outlined in this document. There are many other mentoring approaches that have been implemented in engineering, and other, university departments. The Faculty Mentoring Committee views the Program to be organic such that it may change over time with input from faculty and mentors as expectations of faculty success and sub-disciplinary practices evolve, and as strategies to promote faculty success are tested and feedback is provided and analyzed.

Collectively, the mentoring process should advance prioritization of activities and time and construction of scholarly and teaching networks by early-career faculty, and the process should provide tools and resources for early-career faculty to identify, and solve problems.

Role of Early-career faculty (Mentee)

The foremost responsibility for an early career faculty to develop their full potential lies with the individual faculty. This is easy when it pertains to asking questions about neutral topics; it is much harder to ask questions that could reveal a vulnerability, or may generate conflict. Mentors are assigned to help early-career faculty; if faculty don’t reveal “trouble spots”, mentors will not be able to help them to develop effective strategies for success in those areas of their portfolio. Early-career faculty should
share successes with their mentors; mentors likely have more extensive service assignments in the
institution and professional community where they can market and promote the early-career faculty’s
expertise. Early-career faculty should use mentors’ guidance and recognize that multiple mentors can
provide a variety of experience, opinions and styles.

Role of Mentor

A mentor may be defined broadly as a person who facilitates the career and development of another
person, usually junior, through one or more of the following activities: providing advice and counseling;
providing psychological support; advocating for, promoting, and sponsoring the career of the mentee
(Smok and Stephenson, 2008).

The primary role of the mentor is to take a special interest in their mentee’s professional development
as a scholar, teacher and member of the professional and institutional communities. It is easy to share a
mentee’s successes with other institution and professional community members. It is much more
difficult to ask an early-career faculty hard questions about teaching evaluations and paper or proposal
reviews. Mentors need to understand the details around any “trouble spots” that early career faculty
may have so they can help mentees develop effective strategies for success in those areas. Such help
may need to be offered proactively as a mentee may feel uncomfortable asking for help. It should be
the mentor’s initiative to discuss the timeline of activities and achievements (see Appendix B) and
progress achieved by the mentee. Recognize that it is ultimately a mentee’s responsibility to implement
changes, where needed, in their pathway toward success.

Mentoring can take many forms: individual mentoring by a more senior colleague with extended
experience in a tenure-track position; group mentoring by a more senior colleague to multiple mentees,
and peer mentoring by colleagues from a similar cohort along the promotion track.

A mentor may also be asked to serve as ex officio member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to
act as a resource for the Committee in discussion of a mentee’s case. Mentors will not participate in
crafting the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation letter for the mentee.

Avoiding Reinvention While Custom Tuning

The notion of formal mentoring programs to support the academic success of university faculty
members moving through rank gained increasing attention for institutionalization with the
implementation of the NSF ADVANCE program. The ADVANCE program provided large grants to
universities to implement ‘institutional transformation’ of the culture of departments and colleges in
such a way to support the advancement and retention of women tenure track faculty in STEM
disciplines. Consequently, there is a deep resource base of best practices and program models to draw
on to support the successful career development of all faculty members.

The framework of the CEGE Department Mentor Program was crafted with guidance from the Michigan
State University (MSU) Mentoring Toolkit. The MSU program was developed following a thorough
review of the mentoring literature and provides evidence-based rationale for integrating particular
features in a mentoring program, including organization, participation, and the expectations and roles of
participants. A bibliography of readings, program models and worksheets is available at the MSU
ADAPP-ADVANCE website for further exploration.
Guiding Principles

The Principles that guide best practices for a mentoring program include:

1. Mentoring needs of faculty change at different stages of their careers.
2. Program participants and program design should demonstrate sensitivity to potentially different challenges faced by faculty with diverse experiences, including women, persons of color, and other facets of identity.
3. Conflicts of interest should be minimized and confidentiality should be protected to ensure that all faculty are provided with an environment free from fear of retribution.
4. Mentoring programs for faculty with joint appointments will be coordinated among units.
5. Faculty may choose to ‘opt out’ of participation with the option to participate at a later time.
6. Mentoring policies should be clearly detailed and communicated with efforts to ensure clarity of expectations between mentors and mentee.
7. Mentoring activities will be considered in the annual review of faculty accomplishments.
8. Formative evaluation will be included in the program design to maximize the benefit to mentors and mentees.

The CEGE Department Mentoring Program encapsulates these principles and considers the pragmatic challenges and opportunity afforded by initiating this program at a time when the department was ‘bottom heavy’ with faculty in assistant professor ranks. It is/was anticipated that the program is evolving/will evolve organically as mentors and mentee refine their roles, expectations and needs more clearly, and as new ideas for supporting faculty success emerge. Such program evolution will be guided by formative and summative evaluations directed by the CEGE Mentoring Committee.

Mentoring Model

The CEGE Department Mentoring Program utilizes a hybrid mentoring model that consists of three elements:

1. **Individual mentoring** through which mentors of higher rank will be assigned to mentee by the Department Chair. Individual mentors will work most closely with mentee to develop their dossiers and associated career goals. These individual mentors will likely have close disciplinary experience to their mentee and so can provide information relevant to the specific scholarly program under development by the mentee.
2. **Group mentoring** whereby experienced faculty will facilitate workshop or ‘brown bag lunch’-style discussions of topics of general relevance to mentee, independent of their scholarly focus. Example topics could include service activities, large class management.
3. **Peer mentoring** that capitalizes on the knowledge and experience of faculty of a similar ‘generation’ in which they are establishing scholarly research programs, honing their effectiveness as instructors and choosing how to contribute to the advance of the institution and their disciplines.

Coordination of individual-, group- and peer-mentoring events will be undertaken by the CEGE Mentoring Committee. Peer mentoring events that the committee will coordinate will include the assistant-professor lunch meetings. Additionally, the Mentoring Committee will coordinate a voluntary listing of ‘Subject Matter’ experts that early-career faculty can contact for ad hoc discussions of issues. Subjects could include such topics as grant agencies, work-life balance, teaching. Further, early-career faculty must recognize that construction of a mentoring network will provide them with multiple
perspectives to support decisions that they are making and will provide a balance of strengths among their mentors across all areas for which they seek input.

A tentative, but not comprehensive, distribution of mentoring topics and activities across the mentor groups is listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dossier</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative construction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting and planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of P&amp;T feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X (dossier library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to network, incl. program managers, editors, etc.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating state and federal agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group management strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing manuscripts with students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment design (e.g. tests)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments and pitfalls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing time</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding CEGE/COE/OSU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing work/life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental/Admin Orientation/ onboarding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structure of Program**

The Academic Dossier is the central document that is used by external letter writers and internal P&T committees to assess whether a faculty member meets the criteria for promotion. The criteria for promotion are set by the Office of Academic Affairs, with amplification first by the College of Engineering, and subsequently by the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering. Current versions of the APT documents are located with the OAA Governance Documents.

The purpose of the Academic Dossier is to describe the achievements of the faculty member, with particular emphasis on the faculty member’s development as an independent subject matter expert. 

**Assistant-to-Associate Professor Promotion:** External letter writers evaluate the Academic Dossier for evidence that a candidate has built upon the foundational knowledge obtained from PhD and Post-Doc experiences and advanced the field into a new direction as a nationally visible expert. Establishing such an area of impactful contributions requires publications and conference presentations in high profile venues that are products of collaboration with advisees, which in turn are facilitated by grant funding.
**Associate-to-Professor Promotion:** External letter writers still continue to evaluate scholarly impacts of a candidate’s work, including additional new areas of impact and/or larger roles in collaborative initiatives as candidates progress in their careers from associate professor to professors. Evidence of leadership initiatives in advancing research or the profession also become important at this career transition.

**Academic Dossier**

The Academic Dossier distributed to external letter writers is composed of narrative sections that describe the scholarly, teaching and service accomplishments of the candidate in a holistic manner with reference to specific details in an accompanying CV. This document can use the same narrative sections that are contained within the OSU-internal VITA system; but, it should not be the direct output from the VITA system as the VITA output is difficult to interpret by those who are external to OSU.

Key elements of the Academic Dossier for external reviewers:

**Summary of Professional Accomplishments.** Similar to a bio, this ½ to 1-page document highlights the most pertinent information about your research, teaching, mentoring, and service.

**Statement of Research.** This 1 to 1 ½-page document summarizes (i) the focus of your research program (ii) its relation to your funded projects and manuscripts (published and in preparation) with specific reference to numbered entries in CV, and (iii) any tangible broader impacts from your research (i.e. newspaper highlights, radio interviews, impact on professor, etc.).

**Statement of Teaching.** This ½ to 1-page document summarizes (i) how you’ve contributed to curriculum development and (ii) your approach and goals in teaching.

**Statement of Service Activities:** This ½ –page document highlights impactful outcomes from (i) what service activities you have undertaken to advance professional community, and (ii) what activities you have participated in to advance the department/college/institution.

**CV.** This document should contain a numbered list (for reference from statements) of (i) publications with student advisees noted, (ii) presentations, (iii) funded projects, (iv) students advised, (v) courses taught, (vi) service activities.

**Five Representative Works.** These may be accompanied by a short narrative summary that highlights the significance of this choice of work directed by you as the lead investigator.

Note that the VITA system output is the required dossier format for internal P&T review at OSU Guidelines for constructing a VITA record are provided in Appendix A.

**Timeline for recommended activities and achievements for tenure**

The P&T Committee has developed recommendations of the timeline of activities and recommended milestones (Appendix B) toward review for promotion from assistant to associate professor and granting of tenure. Most candidates have had little to no experience in all of the aspects that are reviewed for promotion prior to stepping into an assistant professor appointment. Consequently, the CEGE timeline provides a framework to prioritize these activities by identifying some key milestones toward developing a research program and honing teaching experience. For example, recruiting high quality PhD students...
is emphasized in the early years, while national service leadership is not highlighted until several years later.

The mentoring committee will act as an orientation committee for new faculty during their first year. The will mentoring committee will advise the new faculty about resources, training opportunities, and topics they need to cover and be familiar with regarding department and university administration and procedures, and regarding the promotion process, and dossier building.

By the end of their first year, mentors are appointed by the department chair in consultation with the new faculty as ad-hoc members in the P&T committee. Preferably, the mentor will be the same person that acts as the departmental mentor in the College of Engineering mentoring committee for the new faculty. The mentor’s feedback will be requested from the P&T committee to clarify specific issues related to disciplinary culture, and generally, to offer a voice for the candidate.

A ‘2nd year review’ will occur, and candidate will provide their dossier during the candidate’s second year of their appointment. This 2nd-year review will serve primarily to provide technical and topical feedback on the dossier, and to identify areas of weakness the candidate should focus on over the next 2 years.

APT documents for the ‘4th year review’ are provided during the fall semester of the fourth year of an assistant professor appointment. This review is an important feedback step for the early-career faculty and will indicate any deficiencies, problem points and also strengths in the candidates’ dossier. The 4th year review holds a similar structure as other P&T activity, however, no external letters will be requested, and the discussion of the faculty stays within the department and does not go for approval in the College P&T committee.

Individual Mentor-Mentee Pairings

A primary mentor will be assigned to a mentee by the Department Chair by the end of their first year in the department. Mentor and Mentee will meet to develop an agreement to detail the conditions of their relationship. A sample document can be found in appendix C. It contains specific provisions of confidentiality that helps to address potential conflict of interest issues. It also contains provisions for dissolving the relationship. Mentors and Mentees may terminate their relationship at any time, at which point the mentee will work with the Department Chair to identify a new mentor.

Early-career faculty members are encouraged to seek a second mentor from outside of the department (may be outside of OSU) as an additional resource that is at arms-length from the department.

The Department Chair will discuss mentoring relationships and progress each year as part of the annual review procedure to assess the success of the mentoring program. The Mentoring Committee will conduct an annual review of the Mentoring Program through an anonymous survey tool. It will also keep track of mentoring activities (meeting dates, participants).

Faculty with joint appointments in other departments and/or through a Discovery Theme program could use the same members of their mentoring team to meet both departmental and Discovery Theme requirements.

Schedule of Activities

Individual mentors will meet with mentee at least four times during the academic year, with interim meetings being highly encouraged. Two particular meeting times are emphasized: (i) early September
to review the Mentor/Mentee agreement and goals for the Academic Year, and (ii) mid-January to
review dossier narratives and corresponding planning of portfolio entries. This second meeting will
coincide with mid-year overview of the tenure process to be presented by the P&T committee.

At the start of fall semester, the Mentoring Committee will identify dates for: (i) a minimum of three
group mentoring meetings during the academic year, and (ii) a minimum of three peer mentoring
meetings during the academic year. In all cases, the Mentoring Committee will solicit topics from the
broad community of mentee. Activity planning may also take advantage of other programming events,
such as through the College of Engineering or Discovery Themes mentor programs.

Responsibilities of the Mentoring Committee

The Mentoring Committee will undertake activities that best serve mentee with consideration to
balancing time commitments of primary mentors, including:

- arranging and publicizing annual programming of group mentoring and peer mentoring sessions
- maintaining a listing of topic matter experts consisting of self-identified faculty who are
  available for ad hoc consultation
- monitoring the list of mentor/mentee individual meetings
- conducting an annual formative review of the Mentoring Program and implementing updates to
  promote the success of the program.

- Recognition for mentoring activities – Listing of mentoring activities will be added to the annual
evaluation report table. A clear mention of the mentor roles will be added to the POA document.

Program Evaluation

- The mentoring committee will seek out a list of mentoring activities from each candidate on
  annual basis.
- A brief paragraph stating mentoring activities and the perception of effectivity of the mentoring
  activity that took place during the past year will be added to the annual performance review
document that each tenure-track faculty provides to the department chair every year. These
paragraphs will be used by the department chair to identify individual problems and
deficiencies.
- The mentoring committee will complete an annual anonymous survey to all mentees and
  mentors to evaluate the effectivity, and identify problem and points for improvements in the
  mentoring process.

Annual Schedule of Activities

Mentors will be assigned shortly after start of work at CEGE.

An orientation folder with resources, a check-list of recommended introduction meetings with staff and
admin and listing of administrative tools and skills needed will be prepared and shared with all new
hires.

Individual meetings with mentor/s will occur continuously, based on need by the mentee. At least two
meetings per year should occur.
Peer mentoring activities will occur per need basis. The mentoring committee will circulate information and schedules of these activities.

Evaluation of mentoring will occur through an online survey annually, and by department chair in annual review meeting with mentors and mentees.

Getting Started

For the Mentee:

Guidance information: (i) Guidance Document for P&T. Carefully read/follow this document and refer to it as needed; (ii) CEGE timeline. Look at this timeline to think about where you may have trouble spots and work to address these trouble spots with help of your mentor(s); (iii) learn the components for tenure as listed in the CEGE APT document and work to achieve them (see below).

Starting your dossier: As you are starting to your careers, document your activities as you do them so it is easier when you get to the 2nd and 4th year review.

Here is the OAA website with P&T information. At the link for the core dossier outline, you will find core dossier outline which are the components needed in a dossier. I suggest you keep this information on a Word document so it is easier to put into a CV for external reviewers and to plug into an online dossier eventually. If you want to see an example, I suggest you ask an assistant professor that recently did 4th year review or promotion and tenure.

The mentoring committee will curate a library of dossiers for professors in the department that were recently promoted. This will be done with permission of the dossier owners. Mentees are encouraged to seek out advice and feedback from these faculty with regards to specific editorial or topical questions regarding dossier items.

Use your Mentors’ Guidance: Meet with them annually and touch base with them regularly. Ask them: to review an abstract of a proposal, to read reviews from a declined proposal, how to get involved in service, for ideas on improving your teaching, for advice on how to get better at.... Your mentors are assigned to help you. If you don’t reveal to them your trouble spots, they can’t help you.

Think about your plans for the future: As you plan for tenure and work with your mentor, think about goals to get tenure but also goals for your career. You should tend to both and write yearly goals thinking about both tenure and your overall career.

For the Mentor:

Use CEGE Timeline: Reference this timeline and use it as a way to start a conversation with your mentee. Also, share the timeline with your mentee.

Ask your mentee the hard questions: Ask mentee about teaching evaluations and look at these; ask mentee about proposals submitted/funded and unfunded. Ask your mentee about their research lab and group, and whether the level of output and professional capabilities of the group and lab infrastructure are where they want it to be.

Provide unsolicited advice: A mentee may not feel comfortable asking for help so you may need to offer it.
Potential discussion topics: Reflect on your comfort level for each of these items that constitute a non-inclusive list of topics for discussion with your mentor

- Expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure
- Early career – ways to maximize my chances of getting tenure
- Using a start-up package fully and wisely
- Issues in research
  - Identifying appropriate funding sources
    - internal, federal, state, private
  - Crafting effective proposals
  - Constructing and managing a grant budget
  - Identifying appropriate journals for submission
  - Recruiting graduate students
  - Supervising graduate students
  - Designing UG research projects
  - Managing a research group/lab
  - Institutional resources, including analytical, computational facilities
  - Developing productive collaborations – when and how
  - Strategizing conference attendance
  - Balance with other demands
- Issues relevant to the discipline or sub-discipline
- Navigating a joint appointment
- Understanding the institution
  - Department
  - College
  - University
- Time investments in service activities
  - High profile professional
  - Institutional
- Networking with others
  - Research collaborators with and outside of institution
  - Potential external reviewers for promotion
- Other

Possible activities to undertake with a mentee:

- Meet at regular intervals (bi-weekly, monthly, bi-monthly, once per semester)
- Write annual ‘state of mentee progress’ letter to P+T committee/department head
- Review a grant proposal or request for funding
- Review a manuscript for publication
- Review a reappointment, promotion or tenure dossier
- Provide feedback on run-through of a conference presentation
- If appropriate, observe mentee at professional meeting or conference
- Collaborate on project or research
- Introduce mentee to colleagues with relevant expertise
- Promote mentee for beneficial appointments, e.g. review panel service, awards
- Attend cultural or social events together
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MSU ADVANCE Faculty Mentoring Toolkit
Suggestions for Dossier Preparation

1. Start in advance! It will likely take you ~160 hours (4+ weeks or more) to develop your narratives and enter your materials into the online system if you wait to complete all of this input at the time of a mandatory review. Don’t underestimate the amount of time that it will take to learn the software and dig into your files for details (e.g. project numbers, proposal submission dates, abstract authors). Start compiling your materials in the online system (currently, VITA) when you begin your position, and request feedback on your VITA portfolio during every annual review, the 4th year review, and prior to your tenure review.

2. Compile information as you go. This is particularly important for documents that cannot be accessed after a certain amount of time (i.e. SEI comments!). Keep a record of (i) SEIs (scores and comments for courses you lead and co-taught), (ii) courses taught, including guest lectures, (iii) peer reviews of teaching conducted, (iv) submitted proposals (PIs in order listed, dates, total and individual $, your role, funded/unfunded), (v) submitted abstracts (title, authors, dates, your role), (vi) seminars (oral/poster/invited), (vii) publications (including description of your role, % effort is not needed), (viii) service activities (committees, events), (ix) outreach activities, and (x) impacts of your work (e.g., press or influence on practice). We recommend compiling this information in a Word dossier/extended CV document following the components needed for the OSU dossier.

3. Develop a list of 5-10 arms-length prominent experts that could serve as external letter writers and, if desired, a list that should not serve as external writers (be prepared to disclose any potential biases). Three to four names will need to be submitted to the P&T chair by June of your tenure review year. At least five letters will be solicited and not more than half are to be suggested by you. Identify names that are known in the discipline and ideally experts in your specific field. Also important are to suggest names from people that will understand the needs of a CEGE type department. Faculty that are more advanced in their careers and/or have served in administrative roles (i.e. department chairs, center directors, journal editors, NAE members, and chaired professors) should be included as well as other established (tenured) faculty that can comment on your impact in the broader field. Discuss these persons and strategies with your mentors before you make your final determination and submit these recommendations. NOTE: It is a great idea to network with colleagues in your field and those that may become an external evaluator for your P&T review. But it is not ok to ask a person if you can include him/her on your list or if s/he would provide a good review for you. Such an action compromises the process and could even result in stopping the review. Also, be mindful of your title. Do not use a title that is inaccurate or inflates your status. For example, using the title “Professor” on Google Scholar or an e-mail signature is unethical and may irritate a potential evaluator as his/her role is to evaluate a promotion for you.

4. Finalize your materials in VITA before you put together your external review package (i.e., by May 31). This ensures that materials being reviewed by external letter writers are exactly the same as what will be discussed by P&T committee(s) and the department.

When you are Preparing External Review Materials...

5. CEGE has a practice of sending out an extended CV rather than VITA dossier to external evaluators. The CV for external review does not have a set format. This document should conform to the general VITA format (in terms of content and flow), but should exclude written descriptions of your role in proposals, manuscripts, and abstracts (which is required by the College).

6. You should prepare four statements to include with and aid in the external review process:
**Summary of Professional Accomplishments.** Similar to a bio, this ½ to 1-page document highlights the most pertinent information about your research, teaching, mentoring, and service.

**Statement of Research.** This 1 to 1 ½-page document summarizes (i) the focus of your research program (ii) its relation to your funded projects and manuscripts (published and in preparation) with specific reference to numbered entries in CV, and (iii) any tangible broader impacts from your research (i.e. newspaper highlights, radio interviews, impact on professor, etc.).

**Statement of Teaching.** This ½ to 1-page document summarizes (i) how you’ve contributed to curriculum development and (ii) your approach and goals in teaching.

**Statement of Service Activities:** This 1/2 –page document highlights impactful outcomes from (i) what service activities you have undertaken to advance professional community, and (ii) what activities you have participated in to advance the department/college/institution.

**CV.** This document should contain a numbered list (for reference from statements) of (i) publications with student advisees noted, (ii) presentations, (iii) funded projects, (iv) students advised, (v) courses taught, (vi) service activities.

**Five Representative Works.** These may be accompanied by a short narrative summary that highlights the significance of this choice of work directed by you as the lead investigator.

---

**When you are Preparing Your Dossier for P&T Review...**

Please see detailed guidelines provided by OAA in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook, COE, and CEGE for the required sections and format. Other general points of confusion are listed below.

7. You should compile all teaching, research, and service information for your career in VITA. However, courses taught, service activities, and research funding obtained before your date of hire should be removed from your dossier when you submit this for tenure (this is simple using the date filter in VITA). On the other hand, any impact from your research (i.e. publications, seminars, etc.) is cumulative, and should be included in the dossier (e.g. papers from your graduate work before your date of hire).

8. Track as feasibly as possible the total amount of research funding you have competed for (both awarded and not awarded) as well as the portion that is directly related to your research group. For competitive grants/contracts that provide in-kind equipment, personnel or use of facilities (i.e., time using analytical equipment at National Labs or structural testing labs) provide details describing why no dollar amounts are reported.

9. You shouldn’t list x999 courses (e.g. 6999, 8999) or guest lectures under “teaching” as it dilutes this section. In 2016, the CEGE P&T Committee recommended excluding x999 courses from the dossier as a whole. Guest lectures are important to include, but can be summarized under the “Extension/Continuing Education” section and/or the Curriculum Development narrative.

10. It can be difficult determining how to classify talks and seminars in your dossier. Here are some recommendations from my 2016 tenure review:

i. Talks should be classified by the "reach" of the audience not by the name of the society. Additionally, I would recommend only using the Local, State, National or International categories (ignore the nebulous “Regional”). If a conference draws primarily Americans it should be considered "National" while another conference drawing a more global audience should be considered "International" in reach. For example, I classified American Society of Environmental Engineering
and Science Professors (AEESP) as National. On the other hand, American Society for Microbiology and Gordon Conference (Environmental Sciences, Water) meetings are attended by scientists from around the world, therefore I classified these as “International” as that is truly the reach.

ii. When presentations given at an institution drawing an audience from more than just a local student or resident population, or were broadcast as webinars to a broader public, I considered them "State" as opposed to "Local". Similarly, talks broadcast to multiple universities or national laboratory groups would be considered “National” as there are audiences across the nation. Make sure to provide details on your classification process in this gray zone.

iii. One member of the P&T committee recommended omitting any interview talks from the dossier while another advised that I should include these. In the end, I ended up including all my interview talks because they provide information on the reach of my research at the interview stage. However, there is currently no consensus about this in the P&T committee.

11. Each P&T case is unique. Think about how your case is unique, what may need additional explanation, and how/where to add this explanation. You may want to include supplemental information supporting your strengths in teaching, research, and/or service including: (i) letters for collaborators describing your role in projects/publications/mentoring, (ii) peer evaluations from faculty outside the department if you taught guest lectures or sections of their courses, (iii) letters from faculty, DT leadership, or chair in departments where you have a strong link or partial appointment, and (iv) detailed information which sets your tenure case apart or makes it unique (e.g., gap in research prior to appointment due to time in industry, maternity leave pre-tenure, unique service activity or award).

NOTE: If you wish for (i), (ii), or (iii) to be included, discuss with your mentors and work with the department chair and P&T committee. OAA has specific rules about how (i) and (iii) are solicited (e.g., NOT by the candidate and many times (iii) is required) and for (ii) to bear more weight it is best for the P&T committee and department chair to be aware of these before they show up as part of a dossier.
Appendix II – Workload Guidelines

Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Workload Guidelines

These guidelines are under revision. A motion at the Apr. 19, 2019 faculty meeting set the workload at three courses per academic year for all faculty. Some faculty may have provisions for teaching release detailed in their appointment letters. The department committed to a good faith effort to review the curriculum and teaching needs during AY19-20 so that the workload could be reduced below three courses per year as a standard assignment.

The prior, 2014, workload guidelines are also included on the following pages. They are under review for update during AY20-21.
FACULTY WORKLOAD:

*As outlined in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, 2020 (Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 1.4.3, page 7):

“The following range of teaching responsibilities applies to all colleges and departments whose missions include undergraduate students:

- Departments with active baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral programs should have a norm of at least 50% of the total departmental workload devoted to teaching.”
FACULTY WORKLOAD: TEACHING COMPONENT

* 0.5 course credit/year for the advising and mentoring of students and/or postdoctoral scholars. As defined by the Board of Trustees (https://trustees.osu.edu/bylaws-and-rules/3335-6):

"Teaching is broadly defined to include didactic classroom, non-classroom and distance instruction, extension and continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars."
FACULTY WORKLOAD:
RESEARCH COMPONENT

- Advising of research
  - Graduate & honors undergraduate student advising & postdoc mentoring
  - Funding of graduate students & postdocs
  - Submission of research proposals
  - Scholarly publication & presentation of research

- Funding of research

- % Effort
  - Service: 10%
  - Research: 40%
  - Teaching: 50%
FACULTY WORKLOAD:
SERVICE COMPONENT

E.g., participation in:
- Department, college, and university governance.
- Professional organizations and societies.
- Advising of student organizations.
FACULTY WORKLOAD:
DEFICIENCY-BASED REDISTRIBUTION

RESEARCH: Noted deficiencies in the research component – items ① through ④ – will result in a redistribution of the workload based on the number of deficiencies $D$ as follows:

- $D = 1$: + 0.5 courses or + 1 service units
- $D = 2$: + 1.0 courses or + 0.5 courses and 1 service units or + 2 service units
- $D = 3$: + 1.5 courses or + 1.0 courses and 1 service units or + 0.5 courses and 2 service units
- $D = 4$: + 2.0 courses or + 1.5 courses and 1 service units or + 1.0 courses and 2 service units

Note: Additional service units may only be used in the redistribution provided the expected service component of 10% is already being met.

SERVICE: Failure to meet the expected service component of 10% will result in + 0.5 to 1.0 courses/year.
Appendix III – Allocation of Teaching Support

As budgets permit, undergraduate grading support and graduate teaching assistanceships (GTA) will be allocated to equalize the varying demands of teaching assignments.

Undergraduate Graders

Undergraduate grading support will be assigned on the basis of 5 hours of support per 40 students enrolled in a 3-credit lecture section.

Undergraduate grader payroll authorizations must be completed prior to the start of the semester so that students are authorized to complete course-related work assignments.

No later than Nov. 15 (Fall semester) or Apr. 1 (Spring semester), a solicitation of applications for grade positions will be sent to undergraduate students in CEGE. A Qualtrics survey is used so students can specify which courses they have taken previously and received a B+ or higher grade. Instructors who would like a particular student to serve as a grader in their class must prompt the undergraduate to apply by the deadline. A list of grader applicants will be circulated to instructors, including associated faculty, so that instructors can indicate which students that they prefer as a grader for which class. Preferences must be supplied to the Department by Dec. 10 (Fall semester) or Apr. 25 (Spring semester) so that payroll authorizations can be prepared and submitted. The Department cannot guarantee graders will be hired in sufficient time to be available at the start of semester if requests are received after this date.

Graduate Teaching Assistants

Graduate teaching assistants will be assigned on the basis of 140 credit-hours per semester of a ‘core’ course lecture with a large enrollment (O ~ 100 students). Graduate teaching assistants will be assigned on the basis of 140 credit-hours per semester, instead of the equivalent 10 hours per week, out of the recognition that all work is not uniformly distributed across the semester (e.g., exam grading that is expected to be a contribution of the GTA).

CEGE GTA Process and Guidelines

Overview

- CEGE currently has approximately 10 full time (excludes summer support) GTA appointments available per year.
- CEGE will use GTA support to:
  - balance faculty workload due to large sections
  - provide support for students nearing graduation
  - recruit top students to our program
- Consider continuity/training required for lab GTAs

GTA Assignment Process and Guidelines

- GTAs will be assigned by Associate Chair (in consultation w/ Department Chair and Graduate Program Coordinator.
- Guidelines for assignment.
  1. For large sections (100+) courses and labs
  2. Achieve “balance” between faculty receiving support
  3. Extend funding support for students (1:1 grant-to-GTA match)
  4. Provide balance to students receiving support
  5. Consider continuity/training required for lab GTAs
6. Preference to support students near graduation over early career students
7. New students considered in exceptional circumstances

**GTA Assignment Priority**

- Funding to recruit top students (suggest a yield of 3-5 students per year); these will constitute future year commitments
- Current PhD students; 1:1 funding support match required from advisor
- Current MS (Thesis) students; 1:1 funding support match required from advisor
- Current MS (Non-Thesis) students in circumstances of exceptional course need

**GTA Application and Assignment Time Line**

- Application sent out to students
  - Graduate Program Coordinator will work with students being recruited with GTA support to get application submitted.
  - Current students will be sent application on March 1 and have a deadline for submission by April 1.
- GTA assignments are due to College HR on June 1 for processing
- GTA assignments are due for review/coordination by Department on May 1.
- Current students receiving GTA support will be notified by May 1.

**Position Description/Tentative Duties**

The following are duties that a faculty may request a GTA (non-lab course) to perform during their appointment. Instructors will work with course GTA(s) to develop a written ‘contract’ of expectations that sets out the scope of activities to be performed.

- Grade quizzes, exams, projects, and reports (assumes homework is graded by undergraduate grader)
- Oversee undergraduate graders
- Manage Carmen course page (including grade management)
- Hold office hours
- Cover class due to faculty travel (limited)
- Develop homework/quiz/exam solutions
- For half-time GTAs (10 hours/week) duties should not exceed 140 hours for the semester
- For a full-time GTA (20 hours/week) duties should not exceed 280 hours for the semester

In addition to the duties above, GTAs responsible for labs will be responsible for the following:

- Participate in safety training
- Participate in lab training
- Participate in lab prep and clean-up
- Procurement of materials

See the University GTA guidelines [here](#).
Appendix IV – Faculty Release Time Guidelines

Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering (CEGE) Release Time Guidelines

Budgeting Release Time and Off Duty Pay (ODP) in a Proposal

CEGE does not mandate a release time percentage for a proposal. Faculty members are encouraged to budget sufficient funding in a proposal for ODP and research incentives.

- **9-month faculty**: Release time can be charged monthly only between September and May.
- **12-month faculty**: Release time can be charged monthly.

Release time will be calculated for faculty based upon their annual base salary plus benefits.

**ODP Policy**

While 3 months of Off Duty Pay (ODP) are possible for 9 month faculty, per OSU policy, the maximum ODP that can be billed to OSP grants is 2.5 months. Faculty in CEGE may bill 1 month ODP directly to grant or other funding sources. Additional ODP compensation is allowable only after making an equivalent (1:1) contribution of release time. Note that university funds applied to ODP are not subject to a 1:1 match.

Note that Discovery Theme MOUs require faculty release time cash to be split 50% with OAA. Credit for the full amount of release time billed will be counted toward the ODP match requirement, even though only half of the funds will remain in the Department.

**Research Incentives**

The department will return 50% of a faculty member’s release time for salary (not benefits) to a research incentives account. Research incentives will be distributed once a year in July for the previous year’s activity and will be designated to a faculty member’s CEGE account as follows:

- Org 14270 – Fund 017000 – Program Number (Faculty Specific)

Note that the Chair may decide to decrease the percentage return to faculty in cases when extra cash reserves are needed such as for strategic departmental investment.

**Cost Sharing**

CEGE will not typically cost share. If cost sharing is written into a proposal without prior approval by the Chair, any requested money will be deducted from a faculty/staff member’s research incentive account.