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1. Preamble

This document supplements general descriptions of appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) criteria, procedures, and documentation outlined in the Rules of the University Faculty and the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook. It specifically details the APT criteria, procedures, and documentation outlined in Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure); Chapter 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Clinical/Teaching/Practice and Research Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Nonreappointment, and Promotion); the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews (see the current Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) Policies and Procedures Handbook: Volume 3); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

For the purposes of this document, the faculty of this department includes tenure-track, practice, research, associated faculty with compensated full-time equivalents (FTEs) of at least 50% in the department, and faculty that hold partial FTE positions in more than one department (jointly appointed faculty). The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the University Policy 1.10 on equal opportunity.

2. Department Mission

The Department of Engineering Education (hereinafter the Department or EED) advances the engineering profession and enables student success by developing and delivering state-of-the-art, innovative, multidisciplinary undergraduate- and graduate-level engineering and engineering education courses and programs; by modeling and advocating scholarly, evidence-based teaching within the College of Engineering; and by conducting and
disseminating world-class engineering education research.

3. Definitions

3.1. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

3.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

• For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.

• For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

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

3.1.2. Faculty of Professional Practice

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

• For appointment (hiring) at senior rank (associate professor of practice or professor of practice), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

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

3.1.3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

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

3.1.4. Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate’s services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate, such as when a faculty member is co-author on a significant portion of the candidate’s publications, has collaborated with the candidate on major grants supporting research, has served as the candidate’s dissertation advisor, is dependent in some way on the candidate’s professional activities, or has a relationship with the candidate that has created a bias. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate’s published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion or reappointment review of that candidate.

3.1.5. Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint additional faculty members from another department within the college.
### 3.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of three professors and associate professors. If the required number of faculty members at the specified ranks are not available in the department, the committee, in conjunction with the department chair, will identify as many as two eligible faculty members outside the department who are qualified and willing to serve. The committee’s chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible.

When considering cases involving practice faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by up to two non-probationary practice faculty members.

When considering cases involving research faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by up to two non-probationary research faculty members.

### 3.3. Quorum

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

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

### 3.4. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty

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

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

#### 3.4.1. New Appointment

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for a new appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. In the case of candidates being considered for appointments with partial FTEs in more than one department (jointly appointed faculty), the requirements for a positive recommendation are determined independently by each tenure-initiating unit (TIU) to which the candidate will be appointed. A positive recommendation is required from both TIUs in order to proceed with a joint appointment.

#### 3.4.2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for reappointment,
promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, a positive recommendation is determined by the TIU holding the primary (majority) appointment and defined by the APT documents of that TIU. For joint hires, a representative of the secondary TIU may be present in the discussion of the Committee of Eligible Faculty in the primary TIU as a resource in understanding aspects of a candidate dossier that might not conform to the primary TIU model or that might reflect a hiring MOU concerning the candidate’s responsibilities.

4. Appointments

4.1. Criteria

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

4.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and Faculty Rule 3335-6-03.

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

- an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in engineering, engineering education, or relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience;
- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated primarily with scholarship that enhances the state-of-the-art in engineering education;
- a potential for excellence in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, collegial, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- a strong potential to achieve tenure and advance through the tenure-track faculty ranks.

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

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

Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the equivalent body of the TIU of the primary appointment in the case of jointly appointed faculty if not the EED) determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor will be made consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed later in Sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2, respectively (or in accordance with the criteria of the primary appointment TIU for jointly appointed faculty if not the EED). Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstance, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

4.1.2. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-6-02.

In recognition of the differing mission of the regional campuses, relatively less weight will be placed on the quantity of an applicant’s scholarship for regional campus faculty appointments compared to Columbus campus appointments and more emphasis will be placed on teaching potential or excellence. However, candidates must be involved in recognized scholarly activity appropriate to the discipline of engineering education. The quality of scholarship of regional campus appointments is expected to be comparable to that of Columbus appointments. The
length of probationary period for regional campus faculty is the same as that for Columbus faculty.

4.1.3. Practice Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-7-05.

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

Practice faculty members are primarily expected to develop, enhance, and teach courses generally emphasizing engineering fundamentals, professional practice, and/or engineering education issues by incorporating practical, multidisciplinary education and/or design experiences. In addition, practice faculty are expected to contribute to engineering education scholarship through curriculum development and development of assessment or pedagogy related primarily to their teaching responsibilities. They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in Section 3.1 above and in the department's Pattern of Administration document.

Practice faculty members are referred to as “Instructor of Practice”, “Assistant Professor of Practice”, “Associate Professor of Practice”, or “Professor of Practice” in Engineering Education.

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

Practice faculty members at the ranks of assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, or professor of practice may choose to have their primary contributions to engineering education scholarship evaluated based on either (1) their expertise and experience in the emerging academic field of engineering education or (2) their expertise and experience outside of the engineering education academic field, including industry. Additional descriptions are found below:

(1) Expertise and experience in engineering education include: previous academic employment involving teaching, indicating advanced knowledge and capability in the appointee's area of specialization within education relevant to engineering; documented contributions in areas of education; and academic expertise and experience applied to scholarship in engineering education and related academic fields.

(2) Expertise and experience in relevant professional and academic settings include: previous employment involving professional practice, indicating advanced knowledge and capability in the appointee's area of specialization within engineering; and contributions outside of the engineering education academic field; and experience outside of the
engineering education academic field applied to academic program development involving professional practice and related state-of-the-practice activities that directly engage students.

Based on this choice, an appointee will have:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in engineering, engineering education, or field of study relevant to the discipline of engineering education, or equivalent experience;
- A record of successful experiences and productive activities in previous employment, indicating advanced knowledge and capability in the appointee's area of engineering-related specialization;
- Potential for excellent scholarly contributions, typically based on applying their expertise and experience to academic program development and/or scholarship;
- Potential for excellence in teaching courses in areas for which the department is responsible;
- Potential for excellence in student advising responsibilities appropriate for the position;
- Demonstrated excellence in oral, written, and graphical communication;
- Potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- An attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, collegial, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- Strong potential to advance through the practice faculty ranks.

Criteria for appointments at the rank of associate professor of practice or professor of practice are consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section 7.2.4. Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

4.1.4. Practice Faculty at Regional Campuses

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-7-05.

In recognition of the differing mission of the regional campuses, emphasis will be placed on teaching potential or excellence with opportunities for faculty to engage with scholarship opportunities with Columbus campus faculty as agreed upon by both campuses. However, candidates must be involved in recognized scholarly activity appropriate to the discipline of engineering education. The quality of scholarship of regional campus appointments is expected to be comparable to that of Columbus appointments. The length of probationary period for regional campus faculty is the same as that for Columbus faculty.
4.1.5. Research Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-7-32.

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period.

Research faculty members in the department are expected to focus their efforts on engineering education scholarship. They will be expected to advise graduate students, and may participate in limited educational activities such as developing and teaching courses related to their research, but are not expected and will not be required to do the latter. They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in Section 3.1 above and in the department's Pattern of Administration document. Research faculty members will be referred to as "Research Assistant Professor", "Research Associate Professor", or "Research Professor" in Engineering Education.

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

- an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in engineering or engineering education or field of study relevant to the discipline of Engineering education, or equivalent experience;
- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a record of notable scholarship in the engineering education discipline;
- a potential for excellence in advising of graduate students;
- a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated primarily with scholarship that enhances the state-of-the-art in engineering education;
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, collegial, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- a strong potential to advance through the research faculty ranks.

Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor will be made generally consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section 7.2.5. Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

4.1.6. Associated Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-5-19.

Associated faculty are persons with practice titles, adjunct titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles. Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on
appointments totaling less than 50% service to the university are also associated faculty members. Persons with tenure-track, practice, or research faculty titles with FTEs of 50% or more may not hold associated titles. Persons holding associated titles are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track, practice, or research faculty. Persons with associated titles are permitted to participate in college governance and department governance as per EED Pattern of Administration. Associated faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of three consecutive years and, with the exception of visiting titles, may be renewed (Faculty Rule 3335-5-19).

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is appropriate for the qualifications or contributions of the faculty member. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

The majority of associated faculty in the EED are either lecturers or senior lecturers. An appointee to a lecturer or senior lecturer position will have strong potential to help the department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing to teaching.

An appointee to either position will have:

- a potential for or demonstrated excellence in teaching;
- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication; and
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, collegial, ethical, and constructive fashion.

**Senior Lecturer**

An appointee to a senior lecturer position normally will have an earned doctorate in engineering, engineering education, or in a closely-allied discipline appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization. An alternative option is a Master's degree in engineering, engineering education, or in a closely-allied discipline appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization plus one or more of the following:

- 7+ years of industry experience in a field relevant to the appointee’s area of expertise;
- 5+ years of experience in secondary or post-secondary teaching in the appointee’s area of expertise; and/or
- 5+ years of combined experience from industry and teaching as previously described.

Criteria for appointments at the rank of senior lecturer are generally consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section 7.2.6, but with the recognition that some of the criteria may not have been possible to meet in the case of new hires.

Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as documented in candidate’s application materials (detailed in the separate EED departmental policy document: Policies and Procedures for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Appointment, Promotion, Contract, & Salary (PPAPCS)) as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

**Lecturer**
An appointee to a lecturer position normally will have an advanced degree in engineering or engineering education, or in a closely-allied discipline appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization, or equivalent experience. “Equivalent experience” may include the following: 3+ years of experience in a relevant field OR progress toward professional engineering certification OR 3+ years of experience with teaching in the appointee’s area of specialization OR an appropriate combination of experience with teaching and industry.

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

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

Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor
An appointee to positions of visiting assistant professor, visiting associate professor, or visiting professor will have demonstrated potential to help the department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

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

4.1.7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty
Courtesy appointments are no-salary joint appointments for Ohio State faculty (tenure-track, practice, research, or associated faculty) from other tenure-initiating units. Candidates for such
appointments will have significant experience in their areas of expertise and will be ready and able to engage effectively with the department's faculty in activities that help the department achieve its mission and enhance its quality and reputation. Appropriate active involvement includes scholarly collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

4.2. Procedures

The department follows the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook which provides important information on the following topics:

- Recruitment of tenure-track, practice, research faculty, and associated faculty;
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit;
- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30;
- Appointment of foreign nationals; and
- Letters of offer.

4.2.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the university and college policies and practices set forth in the most recent update of the College of Engineering Guide to Effective Searches, the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection, and The Women's Place Resources for Effective Searches.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

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

Prior to any search, members of the search committee must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and implicit bias training, which is available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity.

The search committee:

- Includes a Diversity Advocate appointed by the department chair who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants. The Diversity Advocate is responsible for ensuring that the

**Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising (including through Academic Jobs Online), subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.**

**Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure-track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated professional journal.**

**Screens applications and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (minimum of two, and usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. On-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. In the case of searches targeting jointly appointed faculty, the primary appointment TIU will have responsibility in identifying candidates for interview, while all potential TIUs are to be included in the interview process.**

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair(s); and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship and teaching. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format. In the case of searches targeting jointly appointed faculty, the presentation will be arranged by the primary appointment TIU, and should be attended by relevant faculty from all proposed TIUs.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, EED faculty and staff will be given an opportunity to provide feedback about tenure-track faculty candidates’ faculty application packages to the search committee. The eligible faculty of all proposed TIUs will meet within each TIU to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. The search committee reports a recommendation on each candidate to the department chair of each TIU, which then conveys that preference to the department chair of the primary appointment TIU.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on
the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the
department chair.

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

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

4.2.2. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

The hiring of regional campus faculty is initiated by the dean of the regional campus, since
funding for such positions comes from these campuses. The regional campus faculty have the
primary responsibility for determining the position description for a regional campus faculty
search, but it should consult with and reach agreement on the description with the department
chair (or chairs in the case of proposed jointly appointed faculty). The regional campus search
committee must include at least one representative from the Columbus campus unit that will
be the primary appointment TIU. Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional
campus dean, department chair, the department eligible faculty, and regional campus search
committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not
specified in this document. All appointments are subject to approval by the college dean and
all senior rank appointments are subject to approval by OAA.

A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus
dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the
letter of offer must be signed by the department chair(s) of all proposed TIU appointments
and the regional campus dean.

No tenure-track appointment to a regional campus faculty position in EED will be made if it
would result in the total number of FTE tenure-track faculty in EED on all regional campuses
exceeding 20% of the number of FTE tenure-track faculty in the department on Columbus
campus.

4.2.3. Practice Faculty

Searches for practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the
following two exceptions: (1) the candidate's presentation during the on-campus interview may
be on professional or educational practice rather than scholarship in engineering education and
(2) requests for exemption from a national search require approval only by the college dean.

4.2.4. Practice Faculty at Regional Campuses

Hiring of regional campus faculty is initiated by the dean of the regional campus, since funding
for such positions comes from these campuses. The regional campus faculty have the primary
responsibility for determining the position description for a regional campus faculty search, but
it should consult with and reach agreement on the description with the department chair. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department. Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, the department eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. All appointments are subject to approval by the college dean and all senior rank appointments are subject to approval by OAA.

A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

No practice appointment to a regional campus faculty position in EED will be made if it would result in the total number of FTE practice faculty in EED exceeding 20% of the number of FTE faculty in the department.

4.2.5. Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the following two exceptions: (1) during the on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to present on teaching and (2) requests for exemption from a national search require approval only by the college dean.

4.2.6. Associated Faculty

Appointment of all compensated associated faculty will occur via interviews with a committee of peers, the associate chair, and respective program director and/or course coordinator in the area in which the faculty candidate is applying. As part of the interview process, a candidate will micro teach (e.g., present a set of slides from a course they might teach within their role). The interview committee will make recommendations to the chair, or other designee, for potential appointees, and offers will be made. These procedures can be bypassed if the hire is occurring within three weeks of the start of the semester or at a time when faculty on nine-month appointments are off duty, in which case the department chair or designee will organize a revised interview process.

If a candidate is under consideration for initial appointment in the department as a senior lecturer, then associated faculty recommendations should be voted on by eligible members of the department. It is preferred that initial appointment to senior lecturer positions be made during the academic year.

Initial appointments for lecturer and senior lecturers are generally made on a semester-by-semester or one year period, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All appointments for lecturers and senior lecturers expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

If they meet the eligibility criteria, lecturers and senior lecturers being reappointed to the department may apply for appointment via multi-year or rolling contracts via the process described in the PPAPCS.

Review and reappointment is described in Section 5.7.
Other compensated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances.

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

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

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

4.2.7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

4.2.8. Transfer from the Tenure-Track

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

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

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

5. Annual Review Procedures

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review. Annual reviews of all faculty members must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the face-to-face meeting is to include the TIU department chairs and/or designees for all the TIUs to which the faculty member is appointed, while the written evaluation is to be prepared by the primary TIU chair or designee and signed by all of the TIU chairs or designees present at the meeting. The annual reviews of every faculty member are
based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; on progress toward promotion where relevant; and for jointly appointed faculty, to evaluate progress relative to the expectations of each TIU to which the faculty member is appointed.

Each faculty member is expected to prepare an Annual Activity Report detailing his/her professional activity over the previous calendar year, including relevant material from a secondary appointment TIU in the case of jointly appointed faculty. This report, accompanied by a current curriculum vitae, normally is due in spring semester. The department chair will annually provide approximately one month's notice to all faculty of the exact due date of this material. The report contains information on scholarship, teaching, service, and professional development as specified on the forms provided for this purpose. The Annual Activity Report consists of a Word document that follows the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs and a separate planning document that includes updated annual goals for teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development. Information from the Annual Activity Report is used in annual evaluations as noted below, and in determining salary increases (see Section 6). Supplementary information may be offered by the faculty member, or may be requested by the department chair. The Annual Activity Report and any other materials submitted by the faculty member as part of the annual review is included in that faculty member's personnel file.

In addition to the annual review by the department chair, a review aligned with faculty's reappointment, promotion, and tenure is conducted by a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This subcommittee provides general feedback to faculty members at critical junctures (e.g. 3rd year promotion and tenure review) prior to their reappointment, promotion, and tenure about their general accomplishments and progress towards promotion. The Annual Activity Report is shared with the subcommittee, and the subcommittee provides each faculty member with feedback, either written or by meeting with the faculty member.

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

5.1. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-6-03.

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

- in the second year of the candidate's appointment, with written feedback from the Promotion and Tenure Committee;
- in other years in which a more elaborate formal review is not required, with the advice of a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of at least two members selected annually at a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of
spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance.

The department chair then will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, which includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the department chairs of all TIUs within the college to which the faculty member has been appointed must meet simultaneously with the faculty member in this meeting. The meeting must also include some discussion of the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

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

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

5.1.1. Regional Campus Tenure-Track Faculty

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the primary appointment TIU and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these discussions are to include the TIU chairs or designees for all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed.

5.1.2. Fourth Year Review

The fourth-year review normally will be conducted during the spring semester of the candidate’s fourth year of service and will be conducted similarly to a promotion and tenure review (see Section 7, with promotion and tenure criteria applied with respect to achievement to date and potential for achievement till the promotion and tenure review). The Promotion and Tenure Committee vote by written ballot to determine whether or not to recommend renewal of the faculty member’s appointment. The department chair of the primary appointment TIU, in consultation with the chairs of the secondary appointment TIUs (if applicable), conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. Other than the later review in the semester, the only major differences in
procedure are that external evaluation letters are optional and the dean, not the department chair, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

5.1.3. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook.

5.2. Tenured Faculty

The annual review evaluates the performance of tenured faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, and service and, in the case of associate professors, their progress toward promotion. The annual review is intended to encourage and advise faculty members in their professional development, and to identify departmental resources that may aid in furthering that development.

The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

The department chair will prepare a written annual review for each tenured faculty member. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these reviews should include assessments from all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed within the college.

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

5.3. Tenured Faculty at Regional Campuses
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Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above, including any relevant guidance for jointly appointed faculty. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the primary appointment department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

5.4. Practice Faculty

The department chair will prepare a written annual review for each practice faculty member of each rank. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these reviews should include assessments from all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed within the College.

In the penultimate contract year of a practice faculty member’s appointment, the primary appointment department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with chairs of any secondary appointment TIUs, and is to be signed by all chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 will be observed.

If the position will continue, the annual review procedure will include an additional stage to be completed before the end of the penultimate year of the faculty member's current appointment contract. The department chair will appoint an ad hoc committee consisting of both practice faculty and tenure-track faculty. The former will be selected by the department chair. The latter will be a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, selected by the department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. This committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract term is ending and will make recommendations to the department chair regarding whether the contract should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next practice faculty rank (in which case see Section 7). The department chair will make the final decision for renewal or nonrenewal of the contract. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

The department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, and the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review in writing. If necessary, the department chair will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. The primary appointment department chair letter (along with the faculty member’s comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.
5.5. Practice Faculty at Regional Campuses

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

5.6. Research Faculty

The department chair will prepare a written annual review for each research faculty member of each rank. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these reviews should include assessments from all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed within the College.

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the primary appointment department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 will be observed. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with chairs of any secondary appointment TIUs, and is to be signed by all chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College.

If the position will continue, the annual review procedure will include an additional stage to be completed before the end of the penultimate year of the faculty member's current appointment contract. The department chair will appoint an ad hoc committee consisting of tenure-track, practice and research faculty. The practice and research faculty will be selected by the department chair. The tenure-track faculty will be a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, selected by the department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. This committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract term is ending and will make recommendations to the department chair regarding whether the contract should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next research faculty rank (in which case see Section 7). The department chair will make the final decision for renewal or nonrenewal of the contract. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

The department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, and the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review. If necessary, the department chair will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. The primary appointment department chair letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the
college. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty
member’s personnel file.

5.7. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before
reappointment. The department chair or designee prepares a written evaluation and meets with
the faculty member to discuss performance, plans, and goals as per EED Pattern of
Administration. Respective program director and/or course coordinator may provide support
materials for annual review. The recommendation on renewal or nonrenewal of the
appointment is final.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple-year appointment are reviewed
annually by the department chair or designee before reappointment or extension of the multi-
year or rolling contract. The department chair or designee prepares a written evaluation and
meets with the faculty member to discuss performance, plans, and goals as per EED Pattern of
Administration. Respective program director and/or course coordinator may provide support
materials for annual review. The recommendation on renewal or nonrenewal of the
appointment is final. For multi-year contracts, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint
by no later than end of the penultimate year of the contract. For rolling contracts, the chair will
decide whether or not to reappoint by no later than end of the first year of the contract. The
department chair’s recommendation on reappointment is final.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers appointed under at least 75% FTE will both be eligible for multi-year
and rolling contracts. The appendix of this document (Section 12) provides a description of the
eligibility criteria and process for multi-year and rolling contracts.

6. Merit Salary Increases

6.1. Criteria

A salary increase can consist of one or more of the following: mandatory increases as dictated
across the board by the college, market salary adjustments, and merit increases. The
procedures and criteria described below are related to the merit component of a salary
increase. The separate procedures and criteria related to the merit component of a salary
increase for lecturers and senior lecturers may be found in the PPAPCS.

The criteria for salary adjustments will be the same as those for promotion and tenure in
Section 7. Salary recommendations will be based on performance during the past year and on
the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual’s overall record.

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

Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent
professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is
unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.
6.2. Procedures

Each faculty member, even one on leave (except on medical leave), will be asked to submit an Annual Activity Report and current curriculum vitae to the department chair, as described in Section 5. The department chair (of the primary appointment TIU in the case of jointly appointed faculty) will review this material and other pertinent information and will make recommendations to the dean of the College of Engineering in accordance with procedures established by the college and university during that year. Each faculty member will receive a written salary adjustment recommendation in a timely manner before the start of classes in the autumn semester from the department chair.

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

6.3. Documentation

Pertinent information for salary increases includes the Annual Activity Report with any related documents provided as described in Section 5 and a current curriculum vitae submitted to the department chair by the faculty member. Supplementary information may be offered by the faculty member, or may be requested by the department chair. A faculty member who fails to submit the required documentation as determined by the primary appointment TIU, or who submits documentation insufficient to permit an informed evaluation of their performance, may be denied a merit increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

7. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

7.1. Definitions

7.1.1. Teaching

Teaching in the Department of Engineering Education for all categories (tenure-track, practice, research, and associated) and ranks uses the definitions in the APT document for the College of Engineering. Evaluation of teaching in the Department of Engineering Education for all tenure-track, practice, and associated faculty at all ranks (including jointly appointed faculty) is based on descriptions of evidence in the APT document for the College of Engineering.

7.1.2. Scholarship

Boyer (1990) redefined scholarship by describing four areas in which faculty members make contributions: discovery, application, integration, and teaching. The department is convinced that the first three areas are sufficient to describe the activities in which its faculty members will be engaged. Contributions in all three areas of scholarship are "public and open to critique and evaluation; [are] in a form that others can build on; [and involve] question-asking, inquiry, and investigation" (Borrego and Streveler, 2014; Streveler et al., 2007; Hutchings and Schulman,
Contributions in all three areas are situated in the context of prior work. Methods in all three areas pay careful attention to design of the study so that contributions will withstand scrutiny by a broad audience, again creating a potential for greater impact of results. (Borrego and Streveler, 2014; Streveler et al., 2007).

Scholarship of Discovery
Contributions within this area of scholarship will be primarily in the form of new knowledge.

Scholarship of Application
Contributions within this area of scholarship emphasize how research on learning and teaching (either general research, or research in a specific knowledge domain such as engineering) has been applied to create or design educational activities. These activities include, but are not limited to, courses, course segments, curricula, laboratory experiments, course projects, capstone courses, and outreach activities. Contributions for the Scholarship of Application (a) demonstrate application of published educational research, (b) provide a cogently articulated rationale for key design decisions, and (c) support efficacy of the design with compelling evidence.

Scholarship of Integration
Contributions within this area of scholarship emphasize multidisciplinary, integrative, and/or interpretive syntheses across prior research to identify patterns, themes, trends, needs, and opportunities upon which other scholars can build. The research methodology of systematic review provides an emerging methodological foundation for the scholarship of application.


Evaluation of scholarship in the Department of Engineering Education for all tenure-track, practice, and research faculty at all ranks (including jointly appointed faculty) based on descriptions of evidence in the APT document for the College of Engineering. Elaboration is not required.

7.1.3. Service
Service in the Department of Engineering Education for all tenure-track, practice, and research faculty at all ranks (including jointly appointed faculty) uses the definitions in the APT document for the College of Engineering. Evaluation of service in the Department of Engineering Education for all tenure-track, practice, and research faculty at all ranks (including jointly appointed faculty) is based on descriptions of evidence in the APT document for the College of Engineering. Elaboration is not required.

7.2. Criteria

7.2.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Background: Faculty Rule 3335-6-02.

The criteria for an appointment to an assistant professor position (Section 4.1.1) involve potential. The criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure involve achievement of an overall "very good" (see Section 7.4.) record combined with the potential for higher and
more sustained achievement. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity. Scholarship will be a critical evaluation component in the tenure and promotion process. A faculty member with an average scholarship record will not be granted tenure even if he/she has an excellent teaching and service record. Specific criteria are:

- achievement of a very good record in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated usually with scholarship that enhances the state-of-the-art in engineering education and that has led to the establishment of an independent research identity and reputation;
- achievement of a very good record of service, including service to the profession, to the university, and/or to the department;
- demonstration of professional and ethical conduct consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; and
- a strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to professor.

In summary, tenure will be reserved for faculty members who have clearly demonstrated ability and potential to become distinguished scholars and recognized leaders in engineering education, who are effective teachers in the classroom and in advising, and who provide high quality service to the university and to the community.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University. Section 7.4. lists the typical examples of evidence to support a case for promotion, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

### 7.2.2. Promotion to Professor

**Background:** Faculty Rule 3335-6-02.

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

- sustained achievement of a very good record in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- sustained achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated usually with scholarship that enhances the state-of-the-art in engineering education;
- sustained achievement of a very good record of service, including service to the profession, to the university, and/or to the department;
- demonstration of professional and ethical conduct consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; and
- a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field of engineering education that leads to national or international distinction.
Section 7.4. lists the typical examples of evidence to support a case for promotion, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence. In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

### 7.2.3. Regional Campus Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-6-07.

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate education and serve the academic needs of their communities. Therefore, the relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will typically be greater. While the department expects regional campus faculty to achieve a record of high-quality scholarship and publications, it recognizes that greater teaching and service commitments and less access to research resources for regional campus faculty require different research expectations. In general, regional campus faculty are not expected to have a research output that is as high as that for Columbus campus faculty, but the overall quality of this research is expected to be comparable.

### 7.2.4. Promotion of Practice Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-7-05.

#### Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice

The criteria for promotion to associate professor of practice involve achievement combined with the potential for sustained and higher achievement. Specifically, they are:

- achievement of a very good record in teaching courses for which the department is responsible, and a potential for excellence in teaching;
- achievement of a very good record in student advising responsibilities appropriate for the position;
- potential for excellence in teaching;
- achievement of a very good record of contribution to scholarship, typically based on applying either (1) their academic expertise and experience to scholarship in engineering education and related academic fields, which includes, but is not limited to academic program development or (2) their expertise and experience outside of the engineering education academic field to academic program development involving professional practice and related state-of-the-practice activities that directly engage students;
- achievement of a very good record of service, including service to the profession, to the university, and/or to the department, and a potential for excellence in service;
- demonstration of professional and ethical conduct consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; and
• strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to professor of practice.

Very good teaching, academic program development, and scholarly contributions are the most critical evaluation components in the promotion process. Service is also an important criterion in the evaluation. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity.

**Promotion to Professor of Practice**

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

- sustained achievement of a very good record in teaching courses for which the department is responsible;
- sustained achievement of a very good record in student advising responsibilities appropriate for the position;
- sustained achievement of a very good record of contribution to scholarship, typically based on applying either (1) their academic expertise and experience to scholarship in engineering education and related academic fields, which includes, but is not limited to academic program development or (2) their expertise and experience outside of the engineering education academic field to academic program development involving professional practice and related state-of-the-practice activities that directly engage students;
- sustained achievement of a very good record of service, including service to the profession, to the university, and/or to the department, and a potential for excellence in service;
- demonstration of professional and ethical conduct consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; and
- a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or international distinction in at least one of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Section 7.4. lists the typical examples of evidence to support a case for promotion, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

**7.2.5. Promotion of Research Faculty**

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-7-32.

**Promotion to Research Associate Professor**

The criteria for an appointment to a research assistant professor position (Section 4.1.3) involve potential. The criteria for promotion to research associate professor involve achievement combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:
• achievement of a very good record in graduate student advising, and a potential for excellence in advising;

• achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated primarily with scholarship that enhances the state-of-the-art in engineering education;

• demonstration of a sustainable research portfolio at designated funding levels;

• achievement of a satisfactory record of service to the department;

• demonstration of professional and ethical conduct consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; and

• strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to research professor.

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

**Promotion to Research Professor**

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

• sustained achievement of a very good record in graduate student advising;

• sustained achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated primarily with scholarship that enhances the state-of-the-art in engineering education;

• demonstration of a sustainable research portfolio at designated funding levels;

• sustained achievement of a satisfactory record of service to the department;

• demonstration of professional and ethical conduct consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; and

• a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or international distinction.

Section 7.4 lists the typical examples of evidence to support a case for promotion, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

**7.2.6. Promotion of Lecturers**

**Eligibility:** Promotion to Senior Lecturer

The criteria for promotion to senior lecturer involve *achievement* combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:

• achievement of a very good record in teaching courses involving professional practice in engineering, engineering education, and/or a related field;
demonstration of professional and ethical conduct consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics; and

strong potential for sustained levels of accomplishment.

Effective teaching, academic program development, program assessment, course development, and other activities oriented toward student instruction or its evaluation will be weighted most heavily in the promotion process. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of potential for continued growth and productivity, which should be documented in the candidate’s dossier.

7.3. Procedures

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and Faculty Rule 3335-7-08.

The department’s procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all tenure-track, practice, and research faculty in the department. Policies and procedures for promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer is described in the PPAPCS.

7.3.1. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

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

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

Candidates are required to include peer evaluations of teaching as part of the dossier.
7.3.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

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

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

• The committee first determines if all required documentation for a full review (e.g., student and peer evaluations of teaching) is available. Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review. Then, the committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the package that includes documents submitted by the faculty member, as well as external letters and on information provided by all TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed, taking into consideration any MOU concerning a jointly hired candidate’s expectations for performance.

• A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

• Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

• A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

• Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

• Late Spring: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

• Late Spring: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
• Early Autumn: Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

• Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
  o Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service based on information provided by all TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed, taking into consideration any MOU concerning a jointly hired candidate’s expectations for performance to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
  o Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
  o Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

7.3.3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

• To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

• To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

7.3.4. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

• Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not
considered for promotion by this department.

- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

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

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.

- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
  - of the availability of review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair; and
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

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

- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.

- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

### 7.3.5. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the
process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service. The regional campus dean forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

7.3.6. **External Evaluations**

External evaluations of scholarly contributions are to be obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all practice faculty reviews, all research faculty promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews.

A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained for tenure-track, practice, and research faculty.

For tenure-track and research faculty candidates, the department will only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

For practice faculty candidates, the department will solicit evaluations that assess the quality and impact of practice faculty candidates under consideration for promotion. The source and content of evaluations for practice promotion candidates are expected to reflect the contributions expected of practice faculty members. Evaluations are expected to address the extent and quality of teaching as characterized by evaluations of instruction and the quality of contributions through outreach and engagement with industry, the educational community and the broad community of practitioners as appropriate for the individual under review. Evaluations should also address the extent and quality of professional service to the EED, college and university. Evaluations need not be restricted to national or international peers, but should derive from authoritative and reputable sources qualified to comment substantively on the contributions and accomplishments of the faculty member.

A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to evaluate the quality and impact of one or more of the elements in a candidate's record. The candidate's record includes multiple elements and priority of these elements depends on the desired rank or tenure status of the candidate. These elements include:
  
  (a) Scholarly contributions, including contributions to the Scholarship of Discovery or the Scholarship or Integration (typically for tenure-track or research faculty) or contributions to the Scholarship of Application (e.g., improving courses and curricula to apply the best of industry and/or educational practices) (typically for practice faculty),

(b) Teaching,

(c) Service, and

(d) Relationships the candidate maintains with industry or education professionals to stay current with their associated practice;
• Is not written by a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate; and

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

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

Qualifications of the external evaluator are generally judged based on the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department chair of the primary appointment TIU will assemble the list of evaluators. In cases of jointly appointed faculty, additional evaluators may be suggested by the Department Chair of the secondary appointment TIU as appropriate. Each candidate will be asked to submit three or four names for external evaluators, none of which should be collaborators, and a list of collaborators. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, at least one and at most two, will obtained. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department chair will generate additional names for external evaluators avoiding the collaborators named by the candidate.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

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

In the event that the chair is unable to obtain the required five external evaluations, the chair must document all efforts, noting the individuals who were contacted, how they were contacted, and the dates and number of times they were contacted. The department is to notify the college and the Office of Academic Affairs as soon as it becomes apparent that it will not be able to obtain the required letters in time for the meeting of the eligible faculty.

The lack of five external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding, but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, chair of the committee of
eligible faculty, and the department chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and agree that it will not constitute a procedural error.

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

7.4. Documentation

Each tenure-track, practice, and research faculty member being reviewed will complete the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier, and will make available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, along with copies of all publications authored or co-authored by the candidate and copies of all student evaluations of instruction for courses taught by the candidate. Other significant documents normally considered during the reviews will include external letters of evaluation, peer evaluations of teaching, and prior annual performance evaluations. Supplementary documentation may be offered by the candidate, or may be requested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair or the department chair. Documentation required to support lecturers’ promotion to senior lecturer is described in the PPAPCS.

In teaching, scholarship, and service, and in a few specific subcategories of each (outlined below), ratings of the candidate's record will be provided on a scale ranging from poor (unsatisfactory), fair (improvement needed), good (meets expectations), very good (exceeds expectations), to excellent (exceptional). As noted in Section 7.2.1, a record rated as very good is a minimal expectation for promotion in that category. The Promotion and Tenure Committee rarely will rate the record of a promotion candidate as poor or fair, but these ratings may be seen more frequently in annual or fourth-year reviews in situations where substantial improvement is required to meet expectations.

7.4.1. Teaching

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

Classroom Teaching

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

- Student evaluations of instruction (SEI) (a summary of SEIs and, in particular, SEI comments is presented in writing from another faculty member as part of the dossier)
- Peer observations of instruction

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

- Awards for teaching
- Individual letters (not solicited by the candidate) from former students regarding teaching effectiveness
Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding teaching effectiveness

The EED approach to teaching assessment and feedback has two components. Direct formal assessment of teaching will be conducted using the OSU student evaluation of instruction (SEI) questionnaires and the department's official peer evaluation of teaching forms. A faculty member other than the candidate must create a summary of SEIs paying particular attention to student comments. This summary becomes part of the dossier. SEIs will be used in each regular course, and at least two peer reviews of teaching (by faculty selected in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair) will be conducted within one year before the fourth-year review and any promotion and/or tenure review. These will be part of the candidate's record to be considered in such reviews. The candidate may include formative feedback on teaching intended for formative purposes in their dossier. Examples include, but are not limited to, EED student evaluation of teaching questionnaires and informal reviews by peers. These will not be part of the candidate's record to be considered in promotion and tenure reviews unless SEIs are not available for the same course.

The department will follow the procedures for peer review of teaching as set forth in Section 10.2 of this document.

Curricular Development

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

- Curricular and content development and innovations
- Textbook and course material development
- Pedagogical innovations
- Publications about teaching
- Awards for curricular development
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding curricular contributions

Advising

Each faculty member is expected to perform academic advising as appropriate to their rank and track and as assigned by the department to graduate students, and to provide appropriate advice regarding course and program matters as well as career and graduate school choices. The primary distinguishing factor in this sub-category of teaching will be the role of the candidate in advising graduate student scholarship leading to Ph.D. and M.S. (thesis) degrees, and (to a lesser extent) research by undergraduates, including senior theses. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the advising sub-category of teaching will often include:

- Achievements (e.g., publications and awards) of Ph.D., M.S. thesis, and senior honors thesis students advised
• Sustained progress toward the degree by Ph.D. and M.S. thesis students advised
• Service on Ph.D. dissertation and M.S. thesis committees of students who have other primary advisors
• Service as a faculty mentor for student organizations or student-led initiatives
• Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding advising contributions

7.4.2. Scholarship
Scholarship for tenure-track, practice, and research faculty involves primarily scholarship that advances the state-of-the-art in engineering education. Scholarship for practice-faculty typically involves scholarship of application, which often includes course development and evaluation, curriculum development and evaluation, assessment of student learning outcomes, and instructional approaches. The scholarship component of the review will include summary evaluations of quality, quantity, significance/impact, and funding.

Quality
"Quality" refers to the degree to which the candidate's scholarship represents superior intellectual achievement: the originality, novelty, and intrinsic value of scholarly contributions. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the quality of scholarship will often include:

• Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (when available);
• Prestige (reputation and visibility), selectivity, and impact factors of publication outlets;
• Patents, patent applications, and similar evidence of technological innovation;
• Competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically important co-PI;
• Invited presentations at other institutions;
• Invitations to serve on editorial boards of prestigious journals;
• Invitations to serve on editorial boards or program committees of prestigious journals or conferences;
• Invitations to serve on government or professional organization policy-making panels and boards; and
• Special commendations and honors for the quality of scholarship, e.g., professional society Fellow designation.

Because of the wide range of areas within engineering education, research papers may appear in diverse journals and proceedings. In many areas of the discipline, conference publications are rigorously reviewed and prestigious, and can be as significant as publications in premier journals. The appendix of this document (Section 13) includes a discussion of legitimate and community-recognized publishing strategies for Engineering Education faculty members.
**Quantity**

"Quantity" refers to the total body of scholarly results the candidate has produced and effectively disseminated to the broader community, typically through publication. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the quantity of scholarship will include:

- Number of equivalent papers (i.e., accounting for multiple authorship and paper length) appearing in or fully accepted by top publication outlets, and that can be attributed to the candidate's research publication efforts;
- Number of publications appearing in other outlets; and
- Number of substantial work products other than traditional publications (such as software), if applicable.

The number of other publications will be considered evidence of quantity, but generally will have less weight than publications in top publication outlets. Similarly, work products that have been taken into account in hiring the candidate generally will be of less importance in quantity-of-scholarship determination than those produced later. For faculty members hired as associate professor or with years credited toward tenure, the totality of the record will be considered when assessing quantity, along with the expectation for productivity while at OSU.

Ohio State specifically asks the candidate to include in the dossier, for each publication that the candidate wishes to be considered as a serious contribution, a description of both the intellectual contribution (qualitative) and effort contribution (quantitative). The Promotion and Tenure Committee may contact non-student co-authors to confirm such descriptions.

In some situations, non-traditional scholarly products and methods of dissemination will need to be evaluated. The candidate should provide appropriate documentation to permit adequate evaluation.

**Significance/Impact**

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

- Independent external evaluators' opinions of the significance/impact of the work (when available);
- Promotion and Tenure Committee members' assessments of the significance/impact of the work;
- Citations of the candidate's work by others; and
- Adoption and use of the candidate's scholarly results and techniques, or other work products, by others.

**Funding**

As noted above, competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts to support scholarship (and where they are from) will be considered in evaluating the quality of the candidate's
scholarly program. Such funding is also an independently important aspect of scholarship because of the expectation that tenure-track and research faculty will obtain funding to support graduate students to do research and will contribute to the financial stability of the department. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess funding of scholarship will often include:

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

All external funding that supports students and for which the EED and/or an EED-related center gets appropriate expenditure credit will be considered equally important in rating the funding sub-category of scholarship.

7.4.3. Service

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

Internal Service

Every faculty member is expected to contribute to the effective governance of the department, and senior faculty are expected to contribute to the effective governance of the college and university as well. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the internal (department, college, and university) sub-category of service will often include:

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

External Service

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

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

External service is not required for research faculty. Neither internal nor external service is required for associated faculty.

8. Appeals

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

9. Seventh Year Review

The Rules of the University Faculty regarding seventh-year review will apply.

10. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

10.1. Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

10.2. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

The responsibilities of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:
• to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and practice faculty at least once per year during the first two years of service, and at least twice more before the
commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all
the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned;

- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate
  professors of practice at least once every other year, with the goal of having at least two
  peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review;

- to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professors of practice
  at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of
  instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review;

- to review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not
  currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining
  student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving
  teaching; and

- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that
  individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of
  the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that
  the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested
  the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the
  University Institute for Teaching and Learning.

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

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

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should
focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the
course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the
appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of
the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a
written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide
written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are
included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

11. Appendix A: Literature Cited

education research, Appears in A. Johri and B.M. Olds (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of
Engineering Education Research (pp. 457-473), New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.


12. **Appendix B: Associated Faculty Contracts**

12.1. **Multi-Year Contract Eligibility Criteria and Process**

To be considered for appointment to a multi-year contract, Senior Lecturers with three or more years of service, may submit documents and follow procedures as described in the PPAPCS. Presentation of these documents by a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer to their immediate supervisor will initiate the candidate’s appointment to a multi-year contract. If appropriate, it may be agreed that the department’s formal annual review documentation is sufficient for consideration.

12.2. **Rolling Contract Eligibility Criteria and Process**

To be considered for appointment to a rolling contract, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with three or more years of service, may submit documents and follow procedures as described in the PPAPCS. Presentation of these documents by a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer to their immediate supervisor will initiate the candidate’s appointment to a rolling contract. If appropriate, it may be agreed that the department’s formal annual review documentation is sufficient for consideration. Rolling contracts are intended to recognize faculty members based on their strong record of teaching and commitment to the department; individuals who receive a rolling contract are expected to contribute to the long-term growth and development of the department.

13. **Appendix C: Publication Strategies for EED Faculty**

The Department of Engineering Education (EED) Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document includes this statement regarding judgments about research quality: "Because of the wide range of applications of engineering education, research papers may appear in very diverse journals and proceedings. In addition, in many areas of the discipline, conference publications are rigorously reviewed adding to their prestige in the field."

It is, nonetheless, tempting to try to rate a candidate's publication outlets. This analysis must be based on the outlets' overall quality or significance (as opposed to the quality or significance of the candidate's papers that are published there). Below we provide guidance on how this should be done in EED.

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

While these outlets are available in engineering education (e.g., Journal of Engineering Education [JEE], International Journal of Engineering Education [IJEE], European Journal of Engineering Education [EJEE], etc.) and serve as the highest form of publication, many conference proceedings are peer-reviewed, published, and archived elevating their prestige in the field. The consequence is that there is a second reasonable publication strategy for EED faculty: to publish papers in such conference proceedings in addition to publishing similar papers in journals. Indeed, sometimes publications that are originally written for major conference proceedings are then published in special issues of journals. Thus, it is not always clear whether a given paper is a journal paper or a conference proceedings paper. In the EED, faculty will list these such papers as journal publications and will not include them in their list of conference papers even if modifications of the original document were needed.

The papers submitted to most engineering education conferences are typically 8-10 camera-ready pages, not short abstracts that are commonly reviewed and/or published by conferences in many other fields. These full papers are typically subject to peer review at the abstract and draft paper stages (which may require multiple iterations) normally by two to three referees.

The most respected researchers in the field publish in certain conference proceedings, and, of course, all the top conference proceedings are searchable and retrievable on-line from digital libraries run by the professional organizations serving (e.g., American Society for Engineering Education [ASEE]). In fact, these societies are usually the main conference sponsors. Some proceedings are even archived in educational databases (e.g., proceedings from the IEEE's Annual Frontiers in Education [FIE] conference).

Why do many engineering education faculty prefer to publish papers in conference proceedings in addition to journals? There are three main reasons. First, the engineering education field is fast-moving, and the generally much shorter turn-around time of conference proceedings (submission to publication) makes for more timely publication of results. Second, an accepted paper is the faculty member's ticket to speak (for 12-30 minutes) in front of an audience of peers, to get rapid additional turn-around on ideas, and to establish new working relationships. The opportunity to meet new people and to have this sort of personal interaction is an important factor in much engineering education research, which tends to be interdisciplinary by nature. Finally, as top journals offer on-line access through society-sponsored digital libraries, the circulation of paper subscriptions—which other scholars might routinely browse for interesting papers—is declining. In fact, some professional society journals in engineering education are now exclusively on-line, with no print versions whatsoever (e.g., Advances in Engineering Education). Conferences, with their opportunities for personal interaction, are thus becoming more rather than less important in terms of research visibility. We would not be surprised to see other fields move in this direction in the future, and for the same reasons.

Of course, not all engineering education faculty agree that papers published in top conference proceedings are prestigious forms of publication. There is divided opinion about what is the best strategy for publishing. However, we emphasize that the question of appropriate
engineering education publication patterns was not invented here; nor was the prevailing belief that it is perfectly legitimate to focus one's publication efforts on major conference proceedings. We believe that a balance of publications is needed in engineering education. Not all conferences, and not all journals, are of comparable quality. A given journal or conference proceedings will be evaluated as a top publication outlet using the following criteria:

1. there is a consensus among knowledgeable members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee that its overall reputation for publishing quality work is excellent;
2. acknowledged leaders in the field consistently publish in it;
3. it consistently has a documented acceptance rate that suggests only the best submitted papers pass its peer review process;
4. it is among the top publication outlets in its subarea of engineering education in terms of the journal "impact factor" as defined by the ISI Web of Knowledge (http://www.isiwebofknowledge.com), or other "impact rating" services with credible approaches to assessing publication impact.