



Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Document

Department of Materials Science and Engineering

Updated October 6, 2018

Approved by Faculty: September 19, 2018

Approved by College of Engineering:

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: November 5, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE	3
II. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION	3
III. DEFINITIONS	4
<i>A. Committee of the eligible faculty</i>	4
1. Tenure-track faculty	4
2. Clinical faculty	4
3. Research faculty	4
4. Conflict of interest	5
5. Minimum composition	5
<i>B. Promotion and tenure committee (PT)</i>	5
<i>C. Quorum</i>	5
<i>D. Recommendation from the committee of the eligible faculty</i>	6
1. Appointment	6
2. Reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal	6
IV. APPOINTMENTS	6
<i>A. Criteria</i>	6
1. Tenure-track faculty	6
2. Clinical faculty	8
3. Research faculty	9

4. Associated faculty	10
5. Courtesy appointments for faculty	11
<i>B. Procedures</i>	11
1. Tenure-track faculty	12
2. Clinical faculty	14
3. Research faculty	14
4. Transfer from tenure-track	15
5. Associated faculty	15
6. Courtesy appointments for tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty	16
V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES	16
<i>A. Probationary tenure-track faculty</i>	16
1. Fourth-year review	17
2. Exclusion of time from probationary period	18
<i>B. Tenured faculty</i>	18
<i>C. Clinical faculty</i>	19
<i>D. Research faculty</i>	19
<i>E. Associated Faculty</i>	19
VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	20
<i>A. Criteria</i>	20
<i>B. Procedures</i>	21
<i>C. Documentation</i>	21
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	21
<i>A. Criteria</i>	21
1. Promotion to associate professor with tenure	25
2. Promotion to professor	27
3. Promotion of clinical faculty	28
4. Promotion of research faculty	29
5. Professional Ethics	30
<i>B. Procedures</i>	30
1. Tenure-track faculty	30
a) Mandatory review	30
b) Non-mandatory review	32
2. Clinical faculty	33
3. Research faculty	33
<i>C. Responsibilities</i>	34
1. Candidate	34
2. PT committee	35
3. Procedures Oversight Designee	36
4. Eligible faculty	36
5. Department chair	36
6. External Evaluators	38
<i>D. Documentation</i>	39
1. Teaching	40
2. Scholarship	40
3. Service	41
VIII. APPEALS	41
IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	41

X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	42
A. <i>Student evaluation of teaching</i>	42
B. <i>Peer mentorship and evaluation of teaching</i>	42
C. <i>Timetable for the annual and promotion/tenure review process</i>	43

I. PREAMBLE

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

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

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

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

Decisions concerning appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university policy on Affirmative Action, Equal Employment Opportunity & Nondiscrimination/Harassment [Policy 1.10](#).

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION

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

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

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the eligible faculty

1. Tenure-track faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for recommendation of initial appointment at senior rank, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department, excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department, excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

2. Clinical faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of clinical faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department and all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in the department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for recommendation of initial appointment at senior rank, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion of clinical faculty consists of all tenure track faculty of rank equal to or higher than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department and all nonprobationary* clinical faculty of rank equal to or higher than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department, excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

*A nonprobationary clinical or research faculty member is one who has been reappointed beyond the initial (probationary) three, four, or five year period. See Section IV.A.1

3. Research faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of research faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department, all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in the department, and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for recommendation of initial appointment at senior rank, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department, all nonprobationary clinical faculty of rank equal to or higher than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department, and all nonprobationary research faculty of rank equal to or higher than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department, excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

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

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 a faculty member or faculty members from another TIU within the college.

B. Promotion and tenure committee (PT)

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

When considering cases involving clinical faculty, the PT Committee may be augmented by two nonprobationary eligible clinical faculty members.

When considering cases involving research faculty, the PT Committee may be augmented by two nonprobationary eligible research faculty members.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. 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 the quorum.

D. Recommendation from the committee of the eligible faculty

It is the obligation of eligible faculty to participate in this process. All votes taken on personnel matters are by secret ballot. Only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. 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.

Participation in discussion and voting via a remote two-way electronic connection is allowed, with the understanding that the eligible faculty member has had the benefit of participating in the discussion related to the motion.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast is positive.

2. Reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast is positive.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

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

1. Tenure-track faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but the requirements for the doctorate degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. 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 beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should

carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion (Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)).

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

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

Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service, unless there is a revised mandatory review year arising from exclusion of time (See Section V.A.2). Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the PT Committee 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 with Tenure. To be appointed as an associate professor with tenure, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria:

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

Professor with Tenure. An appointment as a professor involves tenure. To be appointed as a professor with tenure, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria:

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

Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure. A probationary appointment as Associate Professor or Professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e., terminal year of employment is offered.

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.

2. Clinical faculty

Clinical faculty in the MSE Department will be referred to as Assistant, Associate, or Professor of Practice in (Materials Science and Engineering or Welding Engineering). Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate.

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

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

The activities of clinical faculty must be consistent with the rationale for having clinical faculty in the College of Engineering. These activities may consist of, but are not limited to teaching of courses, laboratories and other practical experiences, creating and leading out-of-class learning experiences for students that are related to the practice of engineering. The scholarly emphasis of clinical faculty is expected to be different from that of tenure-track and research faculty; clinical faculty are expected to be more engaged in activities dealing with the practice of engineering and its impact on engineering education, while tenure-track and research faculty are expected to be more engaged in activities that advance the state of the art and science of engineering. The venues appropriate for dissemination of such scholarly contributions therefore may be very different from those expected of tenure-track faculty. Scholarly and professional service activities of clinical faculty are expected to emphasize interaction with constituencies beyond the research community.

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 or has not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment. The department makes every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a four-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor of practice by the beginning of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract is not considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself continues.

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

- expertise in the candidate's area of specialization;
- experience in the practice of the discipline consistent with the title of the position;
- professional accomplishments consistent with the title of the position;
- the background and ability to share and transfer knowledge to students.

Normally, the candidate must have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a field related to materials science or welding engineering. Professional publications and actual teaching experience are desired but not required.

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

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

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

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

3. Research faculty

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

Criteria and policies associated with research faculty appointments must be consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Research faculty members may participate with voting rights in matters of governance and committee service at the College level, except that they cannot participate or vote on promotion and tenure matters of tenure-track faculty or clinical faculty (Faculty Rule [3335-7-37](#)).

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

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

The criteria for appointment, reappointment and non-reappointment, and for promotion for research faculty shall be established by this promotion and tenure document and approved by a

majority vote of the tenure-track faculty of the department and by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs. The criteria reflect the preponderance of responsibilities being in research activities. Excellence in research is a requirement, while a component associated with classroom teaching is not required.

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

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

4. Associated faculty

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

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

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are appropriate only for individuals who provide substantial service to the academic or research mission of the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. 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. Consideration for renewal must be done on an annual basis.

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

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. Appointments as lecturer and senior lecturer are made only when a specific instructional need is identified. The person appointed must have the qualifications to teach the course, or courses, as demonstrated by a Ph.D. degree or an equivalent experience for a lecturer or by a Ph.D. degree for a senior lecturer. The appointment

must be approved by the PT Committee and approved by the faculty and chair. The initial appointment for a lecturer should not exceed one year. Exceptions to lecturer and senior lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college and OAA. Subsequent appointment may be of longer duration. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

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

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

Emeritus Faculty. A candidate must be a faculty member who has served the MSE department and who, upon retirement, is recommended by the department chair for emeritus status.

5. Courtesy appointments for faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student mentoring, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Consideration for renewal is done on an annual basis.

B. Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for information on the following topics:

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

1. Tenure-track faculty

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college with resources from the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#).

The 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.

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants. The diversity representative is responsible for ensuring that the committee process confirms with University Policy [1.10 Affirmative Action, Equal Employment Opportunity, & Non-Discrimination/Harassment](#).
- 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, subject to approval by the department chair and dean. 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 to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. Approved positions must be posted in the University Personnel Postings through the Office of Human resources. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their

appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally professional journal.

- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agree with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty, determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship. 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.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the search committee solicits written comments from those meeting with the candidates. It is recommended that the search committee use a feedback form that follows the best practices as outlined in the [College of Engineering Guide to Effective Searches](#). Unattributed comments are aggregated for each candidate and made available to the eligible faculty for their consideration. Additionally, the eligible faculty review supporting materials including teaching and research statements, and external letters of evaluation for each candidate. Following the review, the search committee presents a ranked list of the final candidates with a synopsis of their supporting materials justifying the ranking to the eligible faculty for consideration and vote. Votes are conducted for each candidate from highest ranked to lowest until a recommending vote is obtained. The recommending vote is communicated to the department chair in writing by the search committee chair.

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

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair. The chair prepares a draft letter of offer to a tenure-track faculty candidate, accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae and appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications, and submits these to the engineering administration for review and approval by the dean. Engineering administration will review the draft letter of offer for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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.

2. Clinical faculty

Creation of a clinical faculty position requires the prior approval of the dean. Searches for clinical faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. Highly qualified clinical candidates may occasionally be considered for appointment without a national search, only when there is a reasonable likelihood that a national search would not result in finding more highly qualified and/or more diverse candidates. The Dean of Engineering must first approve the decision to interview a candidate without a national search. Any department faculty member may also initiate a request for the appointment of an individual as a clinical faculty member. The nominating faculty member provides a written statement of the proposed involvement of the candidate in the programs of the department. The candidates for this appointment provide to the department chair a dossier containing an application letter from the candidate, his/her curriculum vitae and at least two reference names, indicating the type and level of appointment, and the reasons why the candidate should be appointed in the department. The department adds one more reference name for a junior level (assistant professor rank) appointment and 3 more reference names for a senior level (associate or professor ranks) appointment. If approved for consideration by the department chair, the dossier (for appointment at the associate or professor ranks) is evaluated by the department PT Committee, which submits its evaluation to the department chair. After a review of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, a recommending vote is made by the eligible faculty according to Section III.D. The recommending vote is communicated to the department chair in writing by the PT Committee. The department chair recommends the appointment to the College of Engineering.

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

3. Research faculty

Creation of a research faculty position requires prior approval of the dean. Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. Highly qualified research candidates may occasionally be considered for appointment without a national search, only when there is a reasonable likelihood that a national search would not result in finding more highly qualified and/or more diverse candidates. The Dean of Engineering must first approve the decision to interview a candidate without a national search. From that point, the on-campus interview and decision-making processes are identical to those following a national search. The department chair determines the details of the offer, including the length of the initial contract.

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

4. Transfer from tenure-track

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

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

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

5. Associated faculty

Any department faculty member may initiate a request for the appointment of an individual as an associated faculty member. The nominating faculty member provides a written statement of the proposed involvement of the candidate in the programs of the department. The candidates for this appointment provide to the department chair a dossier containing an application letter from the candidate, his/her curriculum vitae and at least two reference names, indicating the type and level of appointment, and the reasons why the candidate should be appointed in the department. If approved for consideration by the department chair, the dossier (for appointment at the associate or professor ranks) is evaluated by the department PT Committee, which will submit its evaluation to the department chair. After a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, the decision is made by a vote of the eligible faculty. The department chair makes the recommendation for the appointment to the College of Engineering provided the candidate receives a majority of the votes of the eligible faculty members.

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

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

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

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

6. Courtesy appointments for tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty

Any faculty member may nominate a faculty member of another department within the university for a 0% courtesy appointment in MSE at the same rank, based on expected contributions to the mission of the department. The nominating faculty member must provide a written statement explaining the reasons for the appointment and the candidate must provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae. The department chair makes the appointment provided the candidate receives a majority of the votes of the eligible faculty members. Please see Section X.C: Time Table for dates.

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

V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

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

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, creative work and scholarship, and service as set forth in the departmental guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The purpose of the review is to provide constructive feedback in writing to the faculty member about his/her performance, and an assessment of general progress toward his/her goals and contributions to the department mission. The annual review also provides the basis for merit salary increases. The annual review also provides the basis for a preliminary evaluation for PT considerations. The timetable for this process is given in Section X.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 [\[http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html\]](http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 [\[http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html\]](http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file. These procedures should include mechanisms for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written evaluation. The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases.

A. Probationary tenure-track faculty

The annual review for probationary faculty members involves seven steps:

- **By March 1.** Submission of an annual activity report and current curriculum vitae by the faculty member.

- **By March 1.** The peer mentor to the probationary faculty submits to the PT Committee a summary of the meetings, peer assessment of teaching, or other activities related to the candidate.
- **By April 1.** The PT Committee will review the faculty member's annual activity report and provide a written report to the department chair with an evaluation of faculty member's strengths and weaknesses. If the committee and the department chair are not in substantial agreement, the department chair will meet with the PT Committee to achieve a consensus evaluation and recommendation.
- **By August 15.** A meeting between the faculty member, a member of the PT Committee, and the department chair takes place to review the PT Committee's evaluations.
- **By August 30.** The department chair integrates the PT Committee's report with their evaluation and prepares a single written evaluation that is provided to the faculty member. The evaluation explicitly identifies strengths and weaknesses, contains a clear statement of the areas of performance needing improvement, and suggests ways and means to bring about improved performance. A copy of the report is placed in the faculty member's Promotion and Tenure file. Within ten days after receiving the report, the faculty member may elect to provide a written response. Any response also becomes a permanent part of the file.
- If the consensus evaluation of the faculty member's performance is below adequate and (for tenure-track faculty) the likelihood of progressing toward tenure is deemed to be low, the case will be brought to a meeting of the eligible faculty for review and a vote on whether the faculty member should be reappointed according to the procedure outlined in the Fourth Year Reviews. Voting proceeds as described in Section III.D.
- If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth-year review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. The schedule is different such that the review at the department level occurs in the Jan.-Feb. timeframe. See Table 3 in Section X.C.

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

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

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

2. 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](#).

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

A faculty member may also apply for an exclusion of time due to adverse events that were beyond the faculty member's control, such as childbirth/adoption and impeded productivity. These requests are reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, which advises the department chair on the matter. Approval is based on the nature of the adverse event, the extent to which it was beyond the faculty member's control, and the faculty member's productivity before and after the period of the event. A negative recommendation by any of these parties terminates the review process.

The faculty member remains on duty regardless of time excluded from the probationary period. Annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time excluded. Approved exclusions do not limit the departmental right to recommend nonrenewal of appointment during an annual review.

B. Tenured faculty

The annual review for tenured faculty members involves six basic steps:

- **By March 1.** Submission of an annual activity report by the faculty member. The faculty member is responsible for documenting their accomplishments and contributions for the previous calendar year;
- **By March 1.** Associate Professors only: The peer mentor to the associate professor submits to the PT Committee a summary of the meetings, peer assessment of teaching, or other activities related to the candidate;
- **By April 1.** PT Committee reviews the annual activity report and input from the peer mentor(s), resulting in an evaluation report from the committee to the department chair;
- **By August 15.** A meeting between the faculty member and the department chair to review the annual activity report. If appropriate, the meeting will include a member of the PT Committee to review the PT committee evaluation;

- **By August 30.** Review of the annual activity report and the PT Committee report by the department chair followed by a written evaluation prepared by the department chair. The evaluation will explicitly identify strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the areas of performance needing improvement, and suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance. The faculty member may elect to provide a written response. A copy of the report and written response is placed in the faculty member's personnel file.
- Within ten days after receiving the report, the faculty member may elect to provide a written response. Any response also becomes a permanent part of the file.

C. Clinical faculty

The annual review process for clinical probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively.

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

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

D. Research faculty

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

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

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

E. Associated Faculty

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

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

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

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

Merit salary increases are based on the faculty member's overall performance and contributions to the department, college and university missions. Performance during the previous calendar year, sustained performance over the previous five years, and the appropriateness of the faculty member's salary relative to their peers are all considered in reaching judgments about salary increases.

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

A. Criteria

Merit salary increases are based upon accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as described below:

- **Teaching.** Salary increases are considered in recognition of excellence in teaching. The diversity of educational activities among the faculty is considered. Other factors considered are teaching awards; outstanding classroom performance; leadership in program and course development; development of innovative instructional materials including e-learning digital material, textbooks, laboratory-manuals, and class notes; supervision of graduate research; and teaching activities outside the classroom including both formal and informal mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, and mentoring students involved in capstone projects, internships, and similar professional experiences.
- **Scholarship.** Salary increases are considered in recognition of excellence in scholarship. Among the factors considered are contract and grant success, awards, patents, books,

refereed articles, conference presentations, and presentations to academia and industry.

- **Service.** Salary increases are considered in recognition of excellence in service and leadership to the department, the college, the university, the profession, and society at large. Meritorious service includes participation on national and international review and/or editorial boards, advisory committees, governing boards, organization of conferences and workshops, and support activities for industry, government, and other groups. Membership and participation on department, college and university committees are expected of all faculty members and do not stand alone as meritorious. Noteworthy leadership in such activities is, however, meritorious. Service to faculty through peer mentoring and to students through advising of student organizations is also recognized.

B. Procedures

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries.

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

C. Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that an updated CV and an annual performance summary for the previous calendar year be submitted to the department chair no later than March 1.

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A. Criteria

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

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility is exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and

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

In general terms, individuals are recommended for promotion in rank, or promotion in rank with tenure, based on demonstrated and documented contributions which enable the department to accomplish its mission. No individual is promoted or promoted and granted tenure without the full expectation that the individual continues to be a productive faculty member. No individual is promoted or promoted and granted tenure without the full expectation that the promotion serves to continue to improve the quality of the departmental faculty and programs.

Citizenship and collegiality are defined to include support of the department mission, participation in the governance of the department at faculty meetings and on department, college, and university committees, and a willingness to share in and respond in a timely fashion to the governance and administrative activities of the department.

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

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

Quality of teaching is based on the faculty member's:

- command of the subject matter;
- ability to incorporate new developments, and growth in the field over time;
- ability to appropriately select and organize educational material;
- ability to integrate and relate the subject matter to other fields of knowledge;
- ability to present the knowledge effectively in order to maximize learning; and
- curriculum development in light of the needs of industry, society and the discipline.

Evidence of quality is derived from curriculum development activities, anonymous student comments and evaluations, anonymous student exit interviews, anonymous surveys of alumni and employers, and peer reviews by fellow faculty members.

Effectiveness of teaching is judged based on the candidate's:

- capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the subject;
- creativity, spirit, and enthusiasm which vitalize learning and teaching;
- ability to arouse curiosity and creativity in students; and
- ability to select appropriate teaching techniques reflecting the needs of the students.

Evidence of effectiveness is derived from student comments and evaluations, and peer reviews.

Relevance and impact of teaching is judged based on the:

- appropriateness of the material selected;
- relationship of the material to fundamental understanding of the discipline;
- relationship of the material to state-of-the-art professional practice; and
- contributions to curriculum development in light of expressed industrial and societal needs.

Evidence of relevance and impact is obtained from student comments and evaluations, alumni surveys, industrial collaborators and peer reviews.

Excellence in mentoring is based on the candidate's:

- skill and extent of participation in the general guidance and mentoring of both undergraduate and graduate students; and
- ability to guide undergraduate and graduate students to the successful completion of degree requirements.
- record of mentoring students to timely completion of their degrees;
- significant involvement of undergraduates and graduate students in scholarly activity;
- placement of graduate students who are highly regarded and successful in industry, government, or academic positions.

Evidence of excellence in mentoring is obtained from student comments and evaluations, student exit interviews, surveys of alumni and employers including surveys of former students and former students' employers, and from analysis of the faculty member's record of successful graduate mentoring.

SCHOLARSHIP. There must be convincing evidence that the candidate is effectively engaged in scholarship. Collaborative, interdisciplinary, and individual efforts are all valued. Student participation in research is required. The scholarship of discovery, application and integration are all valued. Scholarship must be of high quality to be of value and it must have impact on the field. Impact may be on the intellectual direction of the academic field or on professional practice. The specific criteria used to evaluate scholarship are described in the remainder of this section.

Quality is judged based upon:

- publication in respected archival peer-reviewed journals;
- participation in respected colloquia, conferences, symposia and other scholarly forums;
- the presence of a coherent vision and an effective, well articulated and focused plan for scholarly activity;
- demonstration of sustained progress toward scholarly goals; and
- the ability to attract and involve students in scholarly work.

Evidence of the quality of the scholarship is obtained primarily by analysis of the candidate's record and review by appropriate evaluators.

Effectiveness relates to the department mission that the results of scholarship must be disseminated. The effectiveness of dissemination is judged based upon:

- substantial contributions to the body of knowledge;
- a sustained level of productivity; and
- utilization of all of the appropriate dissemination mechanisms to reach the intended audience in the profession and society. Journal papers, conference presentations, books and trade publications and patents are all important vehicles depending on the nature of the scholarship and should be balanced accordingly.

Evidence addressing the effectiveness of knowledge dissemination is primarily obtained from the candidate's record and the comments of evaluators.

Relevance and impact. Scholarship that is not relevant to the field or has no impact on the field is of little value in accomplishing the mission of the department. Relevance and impact may be relative to fundamental understanding of the field or one of its subdisciplines, or it may be directly related to professional practice. Relevance and impact are judged by the following:

- sustained record of funding support for research and scholarly activities;
- the generation of original and creative work that is used by others in the profession and society;
- recognized leadership in the field;
- patents, software, and new product or process developments;
- active involvement on industry and government panels and policy forums;
- active participation in cross-disciplinary scholarly activity.

Evidence of relevance and impact is obtained by the faculty member's record and evaluators' comments.

SERVICE. Faculty members are expected to engage in service activities that enhance the academic programs of the department, college and university and help us meet our mission as a land grant institution. For purposes of promotion and tenure, service includes, but is not limited to, service to the university, the profession, and public and private entities.

Quality is measured by leadership and organizing abilities and is demonstrated by:

- successful completion of assigned or elected tasks, and
- significant involvement in committee work at any level (department, college, university, nationally, internationally).

Effectiveness is demonstrated by:

- editorship of journals, books and other professional publications,
- development of highly regarded short-courses and symposia,
- a sustained record of consulting services to industry and society (consultation without compensation is highly valued),
- a sustained record as a reviewer for professional publications, and

- participation on proposal and program review panels for government agencies.

Evidence of effective service is obtained from analysis of the candidate's record, evaluators' comments, and surveys of those served.

Relevance and impact are judged by:

- significant professional society activities;
- significance of administrative service to the department, college or university;
- nature of service on advisory boards and panels for industry or government.

Evidence of the relevance and impact of service is obtained from analysis of the candidate's record and evaluators' comments.

Excellence in mentoring with respect to service responsibilities is judged by the quality of:

- career guidance given to students;
- mentoring of new faculty with respect to career development and growth;
- advice to members of industry and society in areas of professional responsibility and relevance.

Evidence of excellence in mentoring is obtained from exit interviews with students, comments from faculty and staff, and evaluators' comments.

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

1. Promotion to associate professor with tenure

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

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university (Faculty Rule [3335-6-02\(C\)](#)). When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, creative activities in outreach and engagement should be valued in addition to scholarly and teaching activities.

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

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

Superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in this document, is an essential qualification for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure. Insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and

enhancement of the quality of the department and university that are dedicated to the discovery, application, and dissemination of knowledge. The recommendation to award tenure and promote to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has established, and gives the expectation of continuing, a program of high quality and effective teaching and scholarship relevant to the mission of the department.

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

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

TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
Good	Excellent	Adequate

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

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

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

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

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

2. Promotion to professor

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

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

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

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

Table 2: Equivalent minimum performance expectations for promotion to professor

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Promotion of clinical faculty

All clinical faculty are expected to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Promotion of research faculty

All research faculty are expected to:

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

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

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

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

- mentorship of graduate students;
- substantial record of funded research;
- high quality scholarship;

- evidence of a growing national reputation;
- service that demonstrates a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

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

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

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

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

5. Professional Ethics

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

B. Procedures

The MSE departmental procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty members in the department. The responsibilities of the candidate, promotion and tenure committee, procedures oversight designee, eligible faculty, department chair, and external evaluators are summarized in Section X.C.

1. Tenure-track faculty

a) Mandatory review

Mandatory review for probationary tenure-track faculty is for:

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

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

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

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

By May 15. The candidate submits a revised dossier to the PT committee, which reviews the dossier and meets with the candidate if necessary to seek clarification and amplification. The candidate must also provide a copy of the APT document to be used for the review: the present APT document or the one that was in effect at the time of the candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent.

By June 1. The PT Committee provides a list of at least nine potential external evaluators to the candidate. The list is developed in consultation with the faculty and should consist of distinguished faculty (or non-academics who have similar research credentials and experience) who can provide an informed evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work. They should generally be at the rank of professor but must be at a rank above that of the candidate. The list is provided to the candidate.

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

- a final version of the dossier and up to five examples of scholarly work
- an External Evaluator Form for each proposed evaluator, indicating whether a proposed evaluator has a relationship (e.g., former collaborator) or conflict that may reduce the objectivity of the evaluator. The candidate should detail the nature and timing of the relationship and reason for reduced objectivity.
- at the candidate's option, a request to remove up to two proposed evaluators from the PT external evaluator list, along with reasons for the request.
- the names of up to three additional proposed evaluators and the associated External Evaluator Forms, indicating the nature and timing of any relationships that could affect the objectivity of the evaluator.

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

By September 15. After receiving all of the requested external letters of evaluation (at least five are required, with no more than half of them from the candidate's list of evaluators), the PT Committee evaluates the candidate's performance using the criteria described above in this

document. The candidate is allowed to update their dossier. The promotion and tenure package is made available to eligible voting faculty to review.

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

By October 1. The PT chair provides to the department chair a letter, for inclusion in the dossier, summarizing the results of the faculty evaluation including the numerical outcome of the faculty vote.

By October 7. The department chair independently evaluates each case and writes a draft letter of recommendation. In the event that the chair does not recommend promotion and tenure for a candidate, the chair informs and invites comments from the eligible faculty.

By October 12. The department chair finalizes a letter of recommendation to the dean. The chair notifies the candidate that they may view the full dossier, including the external letters as well as those from the PT chair and department chair, and provide written comments on the departmental review for inclusion in the promotion and tenure package within 10 calendar days of being notified.

By October 22. The candidate provides, at their option, written comments on the departmental review for inclusion in the promotion and tenure package.

By October 30. The department chair delivers an appropriate number of copies of the completed dossier to the Dean of the College of Engineering. Prior to that, the committee and the department chair may provide written responses to the candidates' comments.

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

b) Non-mandatory review

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

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

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

evaluation. See Sections III C and D concerning a quorum and voting. If the vote is favorable, the PT committee identifies a procedures oversight designee (POD) for the candidate.

By April 30. The department chair communicates the outcome of the preliminary evaluation to the faculty member and invites those receiving a favorable preliminary evaluation to prepare a dossier and meet with the designated POD to review the dossier with the candidate.

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

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

2. Clinical faculty

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

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

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

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

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

By April 30. The department chair communicates the outcome of the preliminary evaluation to the faculty member and invites those receiving a favorable preliminary evaluation to prepare a dossier and meet with the designated POD to review the dossier with the candidate.

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

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

3. Research faculty

The review procedure for the promotion or reappointment of research faculty is similar to that for tenure-track faculty review except that a tenure decision is not involved. Any research

faculty member may request promotion or reappointment. The PT committee may also recommend any research faculty member for promotion or reappointment.

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

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

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

By April 30. The department chair communicates the outcome of the preliminary evaluation to the faculty member and invites those receiving a favorable preliminary evaluation to prepare a dossier and meet with the designated POD to review the dossier with the candidate.

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

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

C. Responsibilities

1. Candidate

The responsibilities of the candidate are to:

- Submit a complete, accurate dossier that is fully consistent with the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) 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 OAA core dossier outline, including, but not limited to, those requirements highlighted on the checklist. While the PT committee makes a reasonable effort to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.
- Provide a copy of the APT document to be used for the review: the present APT document or the one that was in effect at the time of the candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent. If no copy is provided, the criteria used for review will be that in the department APT document on the OAA website at: <https://oaa.osu.edu/appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure>
- Review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the PT committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so.

The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request.

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

2. PT committee

The responsibilities of the PT Committee are to:

- Review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty;
- Provide an objective assessment of each candidate's progress;
- Ensure that the report on the candidate explains and addresses dissenting votes in the report, and also summarizes and addresses all eligible faculty comments;
- Transmit the completed dossier to the engineering administration;
- Consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. An affirmative vote by those eligible to vote is required for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching, if applicable). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may 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.

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - Confirm a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for a candidate. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee.
 - Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
 - Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The eligible faculty do not vote on these cases since the TIU of the joint appointee requires input sooner than the MSE PT Committee and faculty are able to conduct a formal review and vote.

3. Procedures Oversight Designee

- The responsibilities are described at:
http://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/links_files/PODDuties.pdf

4. Eligible faculty

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

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

5. Department chair

The responsibilities of the department chair are to:

- Verify, where relevant, 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 is not 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.
- Solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the PT Committee and reviewed by the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- Make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least one week before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- Remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- Attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions during the meeting.
- Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- Meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- Inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- Forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, 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.
- Receive the PT Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

6. External Evaluators

All promotion reviews for tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty require external evaluations.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. For evaluation of tenure-track faculty, evaluations are generally solicited from full 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 evaluation of clinical faculty or research faculty, evaluations may be solicited from individuals who may not be at institutions comparable to Ohio State but who are highly qualified to judge the candidate's performance.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A useful letter is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

The department follows the suggested format from the Office of Academic Affairs [sample documents](#) for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

For clinical candidates, the evaluators are asked to:

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

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

D. Documentation

As noted in Section VII.C.1: *Candidate Responsibilities*, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the PT committee makes a reasonable effort to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

The documentation of scholarship and service noted below is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it:

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

1. Teaching

For the time period from the date of hire to the present (for probationary faculty) or since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty):

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

2. Scholarship

For the time period from the date of hire to the present (for probationary faculty) or since the last promotion (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty):

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

- documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites;
- documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses;
- list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.

3. Service

For the time period from the date of hire to the present (for probationary faculty) or since the last promotion (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty):

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

VIII. APPEALS

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

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

IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

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

X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. Student evaluation of teaching

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

B. Peer mentorship and evaluation of teaching

Each faculty member who is eligible for promotion has a peer mentor, who together with the faculty member, participates as a member of the Peer Mentoring (PM) Committee.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to actively seek peer evaluations of teaching through their mentor, through the PM Committee structure, and through requests from peer faculty.

The activities of the Peer Mentorship Committee are to coordinate with the faculty member:

- Peer review of the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty once per year during the first two years of service, and at least twice more before commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction (e.g., undergraduate core, undergraduate technical elective, graduate core, graduate technical elective) to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year;
- Peer review of the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate professors of professional practice at least once every other year, with the goal of having at least two peer reviews of teaching and assessment of teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three-year period or commencement of promotion review, whichever comes first;
- Review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professors of professional 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
- Review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

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

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the PT Committee 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(s) should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the PT Committee chair, copied to the candidate. The report should include a narrative evaluation, not simply the evaluation form. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if they wish. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

C. Timetable for the annual and promotion/tenure review process

Table 3: Review, promotion, and appointment timetable. Dates are approximate and will vary from year to year.

DATE	ACTIVITY
By Jan 1	Fourth year review candidates (FYR) submit dossier to department chair (DC) for review.
By Jan 15	DC informs probationary faculty if they are candidates for mandatory review (MR) .
Mid Jan-early Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting of eligible voting faculty (EVF) to conduct 4th year review; Promotion & Tenure Committee (PT) presents 4th year review dossier; EVF vote on 4th year review cases.
By Feb 9	DC informs FYR of department review; FYR has 10 days to provide written comments.
By Feb 23	DC submits 4th year review package to the dean.
By Mar 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All faculty submit annual activity reports (AAR) and CVs; DC provides PT with AARs for all faculty eligible for promotion/tenure.

By Apr 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT issues to DC preliminary reviews of all faculty eligible for promotion/tenure; • MR submit their dossiers to PT; • PT identifies a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for each MR.
mid-Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EVF meet to conduct preliminary review; • PT presents reviews of all faculty eligible for promotion/tenure/renewal to EVF; • EVF vote whether to move to the final review (seek letters of evaluation).
By Apr 23	FYR informed of results of college review; FYR has 10 days to provide written comments.
By Apr 30	DC informs all faculty who have been invited for the final review.
By May 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All final review faculty (MR and invitees for final review) work with POD and submit revised dossier to PT; • FYR dossiers submitted to OAA.
By Jun 1	PT provides each final review faculty with a list of at least 9 potential external reviewers (PER) .
By Jun 15	Final review, faculty provide final version of dossier, external evaluator form for each PER, request to remove up to 2 PERs from the list, names and external evaluator forms for up to 3 additional PERs.
By Jun 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT provides DC with PER list and faculty requests to remove up to 2 PERs; • DC seeks external letters and input from joint departments, centers.
By Aug 1	Faculty submit nominations for adjunct and courtesy faculty requests to DC.
By Aug 15	DC completes annual evaluation meetings with all faculty; for probationary faculty, the meeting includes a PT member.
Aug Annual Retreat	Faculty vote on approval of adjunct and courtesy faculty appointments.
By Aug 30	PT issues written annual evaluations to all faculty; faculty provides written response to DC within 10 days.
By Sep 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT evaluates performance of all final review faculty; • Final review faculty update dossier; • Final review dossier made available to all eligible voting faculty.
mid-late Sep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of eligible voting faculty (EVF) to conduct final review; • PT presents final review dossier with external letters; • Eligible faculty vote on whether to recommend promotion/tenure.
By Oct 1	PT provides DC with written results of discussion and vote to recommend promotion/tenure.
By Oct 7	PT drafts letter of recommendation on promotion/tenure; invites comments from eligible voting faculty if recommendation not favorable.
By Oct 12	DC finalizes letter of recommendation on promotion/tenure.
	DC notifies candidate of availability to view the full dossier, including the external letters as well as those from the PT chair and department chair, and the option to provide written responses to include in the package.
By Oct 22	Candidate to provide to DC any written responses to DC and PT evaluation letters, for inclusion in the package (This is an optional, not required activity for the candidate).

By Oct 30	DC delivers PT packages to college.
Mid-Jan.	Candidate notified of the completion of the COE level review.
Late-Jan.	Candidate written comments on the COE level review due to the dean.
Early-Feb.	PT dossiers submitted to OAA.
Mar.	OAA review completed.
Early Jun.	BOT approval; PT recommendations become official.
