

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science

The Ohio State University
470 Hitchcock Hall
2070 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Oliver G. McGee III, Ph.D., M.B.A.
Professor and Chair

June 12, 2003
(as approved in faculty meetings June 7 and June 12, 2002,
revised per request of Provost dated June 2, 2003)

Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science

The Ohio State University

This portion of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science (hereafter named *the Department*) documentation describes the criteria and procedures for making recommendations regarding the appointment, advancement and reward of faculty. This is called the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (AP&T) document, which is required by The Ohio State University (OSU) Faculty Rules 3334-47-02 (Rules, Chap. 47, W1) and 3334-3-35. This document must be reviewed and either updated or reaffirmed during the first year of a Chairperson's appointment or reappointment. This document/section is organized as outlined below with the format being required by the OSU Office of Academic Affairs Guidelines and Procedures (W2).

The following web sites contain the most recent OSU rules, procedures, and guidelines referred to in this AP&T document.

Index	http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/facultyinfo.html
W1	Rules, Chap. 47 http://trustees.ohio-state.edu/rules47/ru47index.html
W2	Office of Academic Affairs, Guidelines and Procedures for Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/xi_guidelines.html
W3	OAA Dossier Outline http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/xi_dossier.html
W4	OAA Policy and Procedures Manual http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/tc.html
W5	Office of Human Resources, Policies and Procedures http://www.ohr.ohio-state.edu/policy/policy1.html
W6	Graduate School Handbook http://www.gradsch.ohio-state.edu/GSHandbook.html
W7	College of Engineering A,P&T Document

Finally, this document is based upon the applicable OSU College of Engineering (hereafter named as *the College*) and The Ohio State University (hereafter named as *the University*) rules contained in the Web sites referenced above. Where necessary, or permissible, this document extends, clarifies, or particularizes these rules for Department purposes. If not explicitly mentioned here, the University and College rules and procedures apply.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Preamble.....	3
B.	Department Vision/Mission	3
	1. Vision.....	3
	2. Mission.....	4
C.	Appointments	5
	1. Criteria: Tenure track faculty.....	5
	2. Criteria: Regular clinical track faculty.....	5
	3. Criteria: Auxiliary faculty.....	5
	4. Criteria: Courtesy appointments for regular faculty	6
	5. Procedures: Tenure track faculty	6
	6. Procedures: Regular clinical faculty	7
	7. Procedures: Auxiliary faculty	7
	8. Procedures: Courtesy appointments for regular faculty.....	7
D.	Annual Reviews	7
	1. General Review Procedures.....	7
	2. Procedures: Probationary faculty	8
	3. Procedures: Tenured faculty	10
	4. Procedures: Regular clinical faculty	10
E.	Merit Salary Increases and Other Awards.....	10
	1. Salary Administration	10
	2. Salary Increase Components.....	10
	3. Criteria for Determining Merit Salary	11
	4. Documentation.....	11
	5. Procedure	11
F.	Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion.....	13
	1. Preamble/Overview.....	13
	2. Criteria: Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure	16
	3. Criteria: Promotion to rank of professor.....	19
	4. Criteria: Regional campus faculty	19
	5. Criteria: Promotion of regular clinical track faculty.....	19
	6. Procedures for Evaluation.....	19
	7. Procedures and Timeline for Department Decisions	22
	8. Dossier Preparation.....	26
	9. Hypothetical Cases.....	27
G.	Appeals	29
H.	Seventh Year Reviews	29

A. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapter 47 of the Rules of the University Faculty (W1), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews (W2), and any additional policies established by the College and the University (for example, W4, W5 and W7). Should those rules and policies change, the Department shall follow those 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 upon the appointment or re-appointment of the Department Chairperson.

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College and the provost of the University before it can be implemented. It sets forth the Department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document the Dean and provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

B. Department Vision/Mission

1. Vision

We will continue to be the premier department in the fields of civil engineering, environmental engineering, and geodetic science in the State of Ohio, become ranked among the top ten public universities nationally, and compete with the best programs internationally.

The Department will form an entity that integrates effective teaching from the freshman year through the Ph.D. while reinforcing existing, nationally and internationally recognized programs in Civil and Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science. Augmented by strong research and related activities, our students will receive an education that reflects and embodies the current state-of-the-art.

Moreover, it is becoming increasingly important to develop teaching methodologies and technologies that increase the efficiency of the learning process. The Department offers a viable workshop to facilitate the development of innovative techniques in education and the propagation of new knowledge.

In order that the Department will be perceived by students, faculty, alumni, and professionals everywhere as a leader in teaching, research, and service, we will provide an environment that encourages:

- learning by all of our students,
- scholarship by all of our faculty,
- interdisciplinary research and teaching,
- service to our College, University, and society,

- diversity in population,
- professional activity and leadership and national and international recognition
- mentoring of students and younger faculty,
- continuous improvement of delivery of instruction,
- strong interaction with and support of the alumni,
- support by industry

2. Mission

Our mission (Ref. 3) is to (1) provide undergraduate and graduate education, derived from and based on active research, and to serve as a focal point for academic programs in civil engineering, environmental engineering, geomatics engineering, and geodetic science and surveying and (2) to provide innovative instruction in these programs as well as engineering graphics and fundamentals for all engineering students and those in allied creative disciplines. The Department will create and disseminate knowledge in these areas and provide service to society through leadership in scientific and professional organizations as well as individual public service. This dissemination will be achieved through the creation of a Department administration that emphasizes collegial and professional relations amongst faculty, staff, and students, a thorough response to student, faculty, and alumni, and practitioner concerns, and open consultative decision-making. More specifically, the mission of the Department is to:

- Serve as a center of excellence for research and teaching undergraduate and graduate studies in construction engineering and management, environmental engineering, geotechnical engineering, hydraulic engineering, remote sensing, structural engineering, and transportation engineering;
- Serve as a center of excellence for research and teaching graduate studies in geodesy/geodynamics, photogrammetry/remote sensing, and geoinformation/mapping sciences;
- Continue to develop the two existing strong graduate degree programs in Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Geodetic Science and Surveying;
- Continue to develop the three existing strong, accredited undergraduate programs in civil engineering, environmental engineering, and geomatics engineering;
- Serve as a center of excellence for the research and teaching of engineering fundamentals, including engineering graphics and problem solving;
- Serve as a forum where the methodology and technology of cooperative/interactive undergraduate teaching techniques as applied to engineering education will be researched, developed, and tested;
- Promote synergies within the Department, College, and University in six Strategic Systems:
 - design methodologies (AI, CAE/CAD, computational models);
 - environment (ecological and environmental engineering, environmental fluid mechanics);
 - infrastructure (construction, materials, structures, architecture);
 - geodetic and geoinformation science (geodesy, GIS, image understanding, mapping, photogrammetry, remote sensing, sensors, signal analysis);
 - transportation (planning, analysis, design, operation, control), and;
 - science and engineering workforce development.

C. Appointments

1. Criteria: Tenure track faculty

This subsection establishes the criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Appointment at higher ranks should be consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks as discussed in section F.

- a. A Department appointment must be consistent with University criteria, and mission (3335-47-02).
- b. A Department appointment must be consistent with College of Engineering mission and criteria.
- c. A Department appointment must be consistent with the mission (III, IV, B, above) and criteria as enumerated below.
- d. The minimum acceptable criterion for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or higher is an earned doctorate (3335-47-02-A).
- e. No appointment shall be made which will cause threat to or withdrawal of degree program accreditation in Surveying, Civil Engineering and Environmental Engineering.
- f. The appointment will be based upon documentation supplied by the candidate that there is a high potential or likelihood of meeting the criteria for promotion and tenure and a willingness to undertake those activities, during the probationary period that the Department considers essential to establishing a successful promotion and tenure case. As a hypothetical example, a potential appointee who can demonstrate successful peer evaluated articles, funded research and the creation and completion of teaching modules or assignments is considered to have demonstrated this potential likelihood.
- g. A Department recommendation of appointment to associate or full professor with tenure can be done if the candidate documents a record of nationally/internationally respected achievements consistent with the Department, College and University criteria for the level of appointment being considered and with the concurrence of the Department P&T Voting Body for the level of appointment being considered.
- h. With the exception noted in g.) above, all remaining faculty must serve a probationary period as outlined in (3335-47-03).

2. Criteria: Regular clinical track faculty Not applicable

3. Criteria: Auxiliary faculty

This subsection summarizes criteria for appointment and re-appointment of compensated and no salary auxiliary faculty as defined in Faculty Rule (3335-5-19) (ref. 9).

- a. Compensated faculty categories
 - 1) lecturer

- 2) senior lecturer
- 3) regular faculty with less than 50% appointment
- 4) visiting faculty - on leave from other universities or similar institutions
- 5) visiting faculty - temporary
- b. No salary auxiliary faculty
 - 1) adjunct faculty
 - 2) regular faculty - zero time appointment
 - 3) visiting faculty
- c. No auxiliary appointment will be considered without demonstration of substantial involvement in the academic nature of the Department by the auxiliary faculty.
- d. Auxiliary faculty in the Adjunct or Visiting Categories shall be appointed to a rank by applying as consistently as possible the criteria for the equivalent rank in the regular faculty. The Department P&T Committee will be consulted to determine the appropriateness of the intended appointment rank.
- e. Graduate advising privileges for auxiliary faculty shall be granted in accordance with Department Graduate School criteria and procedures (W6). In no case will an auxiliary faculty be able to advise Ph.D. students without possession of the earned doctorate.
- f. Renewal is granted in accordance with Faculty Rules (3335-5-19) and the minimum criterion for re-appointment is a re-certification of the justification provided in c.), including for those teaching courses, a demonstration of satisfactory teaching evaluations. Continued re-appointment for teaching duties must be based upon improvement in teaching evaluation beyond the "average".

4. Criteria: Courtesy appointments for regular faculty

This section establishes Department policies concerning no-salary Department courtesy appointments for regular Ohio State faculty from other tenure-initiating units.

- a. The minimum acceptable criterion for a suitable courtesy appointment is demonstration of the substantial nature of the appointee's contribution to the Department.
- b. Re-appointment of this appointment will be based upon re-certification of the justification in a.). Appointments involving teaching re-appointment will also include an assessment of the teaching evaluation results with a view towards ensuring that teaching is of satisfactory quality.

5. Procedures: Tenure track faculty

This subsection documents the procedures used to perform national/international searches and identify recommended applicants for appointment to regular faculty status. This process is consistent with procedures summarized in the OAA Policy and Procedures Manual (W4) and the Office of Human Resources' Policy and Procedures Manual (W5).

6. Procedures: Regular clinical faculty
Not applicable
7. Procedures: Auxiliary Faculty

As opposed to regular faculty searches where the Department pro-actively solicits new members of its faculty through a national search, auxiliary faculty appointments are typically temporary arrangements between the Department and the auxiliary candidate to fill a specific course, advising or service duty. Procedures are therefore somewhat different than for regular faculty searches.

- a. Through the normal review of annual teaching assignments, the recommendation of a faculty committee or the Student Advisory Board, or the recommendation of an individual faculty member, the Chairperson will be made aware of the need for an auxiliary faculty.
- b. The Chairperson will solicit the justification for the auxiliary faculty from the recommender(s).
- c. The Chairperson will solicit a curriculum vitae/resume from the potential faculty and ask for a review of credentials and a recommendation of appropriate rank from the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- d. If necessary, the Chairperson will ask the Department Graduate Studies Committee to assess the potential faculty's graduate advising status (category).
- e. The Chairperson will make the final determination as to the hiring, rank, and salary of the auxiliary faculty.
- f. The procedure for re-hiring will essentially repeat steps a–d augmented by the additional step of reviewing and evaluating the past year's teaching evaluation data.

8. Procedure: Courtesy appointments for regular faculty

The procedure for initiating and evaluating a courtesy appointment shall essentially consist of the steps followed in subsection 7 above for auxiliary faculty. The motivations for establishing a courtesy appointment are derived primarily from the need to demonstrate interdisciplinary cooperation and provide for valuable expertise in the administration of Department degree programs: The recommender(s) of the courtesy appointment are responsible for justifying the value to the Department of the courtesy appointment with these two motivations in mind.

D. Annual Reviews

1. General Review Procedures

These policies and procedures are consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-47-03 as well as the policies described in the OAA Policy and Procedures Handbook (W4) and relevant College policies described in W7. The policies in this section apply to all regular faculties regardless of rank or tenure status.

- a. All regular faculties will have an annual performance evaluation or review performed by the Department Chairperson.
- b. The annual review, ideally, will be comprised of information in the format of activity data supplied by the faculty and the results of a meeting between the faculty and the Chairperson. The meeting is required for all probationary faculty. The meeting is not required for tenured faculty but must take place if either the Chairperson or the faculty requests it.
- c. The faculty member is responsible for acquiring, preparing and submitting the activity data in the required form by the requested time. The department is under no obligation to accept data that are submitted late or in the wrong format.
- d. The activity data consists of two parts.
 - 1) An updated vitae fully annotated to show every single academic duty, responsibility, or undertaking the faculty member has been involved with during the past year for which he/she wishes to receive evaluation and possible consideration for a merit salary increase. The distribution and level of detail of information required in the vitae is identical to that required for the promotion and tenure dossier and described in W3.
 - 2) The form of the vitae data for all non-tenured faculty shall be as described in the office of academic affairs most recent guidelines for the submission of dossiers (W3).
- e. Each year a letter will be distributed to the faculty on or about the beginning of Spring Quarter outlining the activity data submission deadline, summary table format (if required), and the period during which evaluation meetings can be scheduled.
- f. No official evaluation meeting will take place without the annual activity data having been prepared and submitted in advance of the meeting.
- g. The meeting will concentrate upon discussion of the circumstances and quality of the various items in the activity summary, an examination of how the faculty responded to suggestions from the previous reviews, a review of the near-term goals of the faculty and those the Department Chairperson may have for the faculty, and provide a forum for identifying Department or faculty issues which need change, modification or improvement.
- h. Typically, a two-week period will be available for the meetings; only in prearranged cases will the two-week meeting period be extended. .
- i. After the activity data have been solicited and the meetings have been held the Chairperson will prepare a written evaluation and every effort will be made to forward the report to the faculty before the end of Spring quarter.

2. Procedures: Probationary faculty

- a. At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with a letter containing the URL addresses to all the current pertinent documents detailing tenure initiating unit, College, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised

during the probationary period, all faculty members shall be provided with electronic notice of the revised documents (3334-47-03-1).

- b. During a probationary period a faculty member shall be reviewed annually in accordance with this rule and with policies of the tenure-initiating unit, College and University (W1, W2, W7). The annual review should encompass the faculty member's performance in teaching, in scholarship, and in service; as well as evidence of continuing development. The involvement of tenure initiating unit faculty in annual reviews is strongly encouraged. External evaluations of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the faculty review body or tenure initiating unit Chairperson. The tenure initiating unit Chairperson shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (W3) to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. At the completion of the review the tenure-initiating unit Chairperson shall provide the faculty member and the Dean of the College with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The assessment should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. If the Chairperson's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. A recommendation from the Chairperson to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth-year review procedures and the Dean shall make the final decision in the matter. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review of promotion and tenure.
- c. The fourth year review of probationary faculty (W1) shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion at the tenure initiating unit and College levels with two exceptions: (a) solicitation of external letters of evaluation may or may not be required by the tenure initiating unit, and; (b) review by the College promotion and tenure committee shall be optional in all cases where both the tenure initiating unit and the Dean approve the renewal of the appointment.

Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the College. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the tenure initiating unit's recommendation, the Dean must consult with the College promotion and tenure committee.

The following additional Department rules apply.

- d. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have primary responsibility for performing and preparing an annual review of probationary tenure track faculty on behalf of the Voting Body. In the event that this committee recommends reappointment of the probationary

appointment, it shall submit its report and recommendation to the Chairperson. In the event that it believes non-renewal of the appointment is appropriate, it shall refer the case to the Voting Body for review and vote.

- e. The criteria to be applied to this evaluation are those published in this manual for the sixth year tenure with promotion to associate professor or the granting of tenure at advanced levels in the case of newly hired faculty at the associate or full professor level.
 - f. The Promotion and Tenure Committee annual evaluation shall be prepared and forwarded to the Chairperson (or to the Voting Body if appropriate) sufficiently in advance of the end of an academic year for fourth-year review procedures to be completed if they are needed to consider a recommendation or non-renewal.
 - g. If the Chairperson recommends reappointment, regardless of the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee or Voting Body, that recommendation is final. If the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends reappointment, but the Chairperson believes that non-renewal shall be considered, the Chairperson will ask the Voting Body to review the case and vote on the matter of reappointment. If the Chairperson then recommends non-renewal of the appointment, regardless of the recommendation of the Voting Body, the comments process must be followed and the case sent to the Dean for College level review. The Dean will make the final decision. In any instance where the Chairperson anticipates providing advice or making of recommendation that differs from that of the Promotion and Tenure Committee or Voting Body, the Chairperson will meet with that body to communicate his/her reasons and to seek to resolve differences where possible.
 - h. The Department reserves the right not to renew a probationary appointment following any annual review in which performance and professional development to date make it unlikely that the faculty member will meet expectations for promotion and tenure in the time remaining in the probationary period.
 - i. All annual review reports recommending reappointment should clearly describe strengths and weaknesses and set forth specific advice and expectations for continued professional development.
3. Procedures: Tenured faculty
No specialized procedures beyond those discussed in V III.D.1 are required.
 4. Procedures: Regular clinical faculty
Does not apply.

E. Merit Salary Increases And Other Awards

1. Salary Administration
Salary administration is the responsibility of the Department Chairperson.
2. Salary Increase Components

- a. A salary increase can consist of one or more of the following components:
 - a) mandatory, independent, of merit;
 - b) special market or equity adjustments;
 - c) certain special University awards which consist of a predetermined salary increase; and
 - d) merit.
3. Criteria for Determining Merit Salary
- a. Merit raises are considered for significant accomplishment beyond the ordinary level (see norms in VII) that is expected of a faculty member in any one or all of the areas of teaching, research and service.
 - b. Merit raises are recommended for significant accomplishment or awards that bring national and international credit to the Department, College, and University.
 - c. Merit raises are recommended for faculty who alleviate the Department, College, and University from hardship or other difficult administrative or programmatic circumstances.
4. Documentation
- a. The data required for determining merit salary are those required in the annual report submission.
 - b. The faculty member is responsible for providing all the data in support of his/her case for merit salary raises in the form and time periods specified in Section V III.E.1
 - c. No merit salary raises will be given if the activity data and the activity data summary (if required) are not submitted in time or proper form.
5. Procedure

The assessment of annual review of data submitted in consideration of merit salary increases must be evaluated with regard to the criteria above and a means of attributing departure from Department norms identified. Departure from norms may derive from both high productivity or high quality and a means of assessing both is necessary.

- a. Guidelines for quantitative assessment of merit increases
 - 1) Activity data summary sheets will be entered into a composite database yielding an annual integrated summary of Department activity.
 - 2) This composite database will be subset into average annual performance figures in each category for the whole Department as well as by faculty rank.
 - 3) The annual Department average data will be contrasted with the workload policy and adjustments for Department-wide performance in excess of the average expectation made.
 - 4) Faculty with above-average Department activity will be identified in overall activity as well as research, teaching, or service individually.

Above-average and well-above-average activities will be determined.

5) It is anticipated that between 40–60% of the merit salary raise available to the Department will be distributed on quantitative measures.

b. Guidelines for merit assessment based upon quality.

Assessing the quality of a faculty's work and designating that quality as superior to another's work is extremely difficult. Many if not most of the available procedures are highly subjective and therefore, must be applied with special care.

1) Research quality indicators could include but not be limited to:

- The name of the journal in which an article is published, and its relative standing in a field as assessed by the citation index.
- The quality of the funding agency, the degree of competition for grants, and the success rate of the funding program.
- Major national and international research awards.
- Keynote and plenary addresses at major national or international conferences.
- Graduate students receiving awards for research performed at OSU.
- Advised, graduated students with significant post-graduate employment at major national laboratories, companies or universities.

2) Teaching quality indicators could include but are not limited to

- Major teaching awards from the University or national societies
- Adoption of teaching techniques at major universities.
- Creation of new curricula and/or courses that results in steadily increasing enrollments or the demand for these courses through distance education.
- Acquisition of education-based research funding from major national funding agencies.
- Creation of any instructional materials or textbook widely adopted throughout the nation or world.

3) Service quality indicators could include but are not limited to

- Leadership of professional committees for major national/international professional societies or agencies
- Organizational and editorial leadership of major national and international conferences and symposia.
- Leadership of University/graduate school committees
- Leadership of national/international review panels.

4) It shall be incumbent upon each faculty member to provide the "quality" information to the Chairperson in a form that can be readily understood and even verified by the Chairperson and the faculty. The

Department Chairperson will never be capable of determining quality without the proactive formulation and transmittal of such information by each faculty to the Chairperson during the annual evaluation. The Chairperson may call upon the Promotion and Tenure Committee or the Executive Committee for advice on questions of interpretation of the information.

F. Reviews For Promotion And Tenure And For Promotion

1. Preamble/Overview

After educational activities, the next most important activity we perform as a faculty is the promotion and tenure (P&T) of faculty. This section documents the procedures, criteria and documentation components of the P&T process. Faculty Rule 3335-47 (W1) is the fundamental document in compiling this procedure as supplemented by College Guidelines (W7). This section provides an overview of the process as detailed in the following subsection and is composed from ideas in a presentation to a Workshop for Faculty regarding Promotion and Tenure by the Vice Provost for Academic Policy and Human Resources and the College Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure (W7).

a. Expectations

The University mission requires excellence in teaching, research and service for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure and for promotion to full professor.

1) Teaching

Excellence in classroom instruction, in supervision of independent study and graduate advising, and in curriculum development is expected. Both peer and student evaluation of teaching is essential. Evidence of successful graduate advising is of particular importance for promotion to the rank of full professor.

From the College and Department perspective, a good teacher meets classes on time, prepares lectures in advance, provides to the students useful homework and, as appropriate, lab assignments, maintains adequate office hours for his/her students, grades fairly, covers the material prescribed in the course syllabus which is distributed at the first meeting of the course, and spells out clearly for students what is expected of them in the course. A good teacher should also communicate clearly and effectively. It is understood that recognition of superior teaching effectiveness may require a period of several years to become an established fact. It is understood that innovative and imaginative approaches to teaching may be the subject of controversy as to their merits and that such controversy should not reflect adversely on the faculty member displaying such initiative.

An important role of each Department within the College is to provide appropriate inter-disciplinary courses for other College and University Departments and curricula, and occasionally for the general community. This responsibility places a premium on the effective teacher that, in turn, is reflected in the value that is placed on the contribution of the faculty member towards the general teaching effort. It is well recognized that a good teacher is continuously active in cur-

riculum improvement and new course development, which may include textbooks, teaching aids and computer assisted instruction. This aspect will also form an important component of the teaching evaluation of a faculty member.

2) Research, Scholarly, or Creative Activity

There must be evidence of a focused body of high quality work that is assessed by both peers and external evaluators to have made an impact on the field of study, as well as evidence of strong potential for continued high quality work. Additionally for promotion to the rank of full professor, the faculty member should be a nationally and internationally (if relevant) recognized expert in her or his field. Both the quantity and quality of the scholarly work are important, as is the pattern of production during the probationary period or period since the last promotion.

From the College and Department perspective, faculty members are expected to be current in their knowledge of recent advances in their field(s) of specialization within Civil and Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science and to continue to make contributions to its literature and art. Evidence of this activity is normally provided by publication in refereed journals or proceedings, presentation of scientific papers at professional meetings, and success in obtaining grants and contracts for funded research. Other pertinent scholarly activities include the development of courses dealing with recent research and conducting advanced seminars or symposia. Because of the wide range of our science and engineering, research papers may appear in very diverse journals. Research is to be judged by its impact on the specialized field rather than by the particular journal in which it appears. The research is normally judged by obtaining opinions from peers, some of who may be selected from a list provided by the candidate. It must be emphasized that judgment of peers concerning the quality and importance of the research is the key consideration—not solely the counting of numbers of publications or grants.

3) Service

Service activities can take a wide variety of forms, including administrative service to the Department, College and University; service to the profession, and public service in which a faculty member applies her or his professional expertise to the amelioration of public problems. For promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure, evidence of high quality contributions to Department administration and to other areas as defined by the Department is expected. For promotion to the rank of full professor, evidence of leadership in service roles both within and external to the University, especially in national and international activities, is expected.

The College and Department places emphasis both on theoretical foundations and on applications in virtually all disciplines. Consulting by a faculty member is an aspect of his/her service contribution if the consulting contributes to the professional development of the faculty member. Consultation with other researchers within the University, industry, or with Government personnel may form an important component of a faculty member's research. Publications or other creative outcomes resulting from such activities, on their merits, may be regarded as research evidence in his/her field in addition to the service element they provide.

In all areas of endeavor, a faculty member must contribute to the goals and needs of her or his Department. The University could not meet the needs of its students or programs if faculty

members were to allow only self-interest to govern their professional activities and did not interact productively, collegially, and professionally with colleagues in working toward Department goals.

It is essential that the faculty understands the expectations for promotion and tenure of the Department, College, and University and that they fully document their accomplishments relevant to these expectations on an on-going basis. In addition, faculty should recognize that standards rise slowly but continuously and that for a positive decision they must meet the standards in place at the time they are reviewed, not those of past years.

All faculty members should seek a balance in the allocation of time between teaching, research and service. One cannot be neglected for the other. In addition, for probationary faculty the probationary period passes quickly and it is important to stay focused on those things that matter most for the attainment of tenure and promotion. These include excellence in teaching in those areas noted to be most important by one's Department, and development of a focused program of research. Probationary faculty should reasonably limit service. The probationary period is not the time for faculty members to voluntarily take on numerous committees and time-consuming professional roles that detract from efforts to establish themselves as excellent teachers/scholars. On the other hand, it is inappropriate to try and avoid all service. Probationary faculty members are expected to demonstrate their willingness and ability to be contributing members of their Departments and Colleges. Tenured faculty have a professional obligation to share in the administration of the Department, College, and University and to provide other kinds of professional service.

All faculty should continuously demonstrate initiative in making ways to be successful. While academic units will make appropriate efforts to help new faculty get oriented and be productive, the Department will appropriately assume that the person with the best prospects for long term success is one who demonstrates initiative and independence in pursuing individual goals and cooperation in pursuing Department goals.

b. Documentation

- 1) It is important to keep records on an ongoing basis through both a file system (for letters, programs, etc.) and continuous updating of the curriculum vitae. Records should be organized to coincide with the information required by the University for the core of the promotion and tenure dossier.
- 2) Student evaluation of every course offered is required by the Faculty Rules and is essential for performance reviews. Idiosyncratic evaluation tools are not useful in performance reviews because they do not allow comparison among faculty. However, faculty members can use any form of evaluation that is meaningful to them for personal diagnostic use.
- 3) Systematic peer review of classroom teaching and instructional materials is essential. "Systematic" means periodic evaluations over the course of the probationary period or period since the last promotion.

- 4) Faculty members should keep a record of revisions made in courses, teaching materials, and techniques in response to either self-evaluation or evaluation by others. Evidence of commitment to teaching and of efforts to improve is important.
- 5) Accurate records of grant applications, papers presented and publications are essential. When work is co-authored, the faculty member must be able to indicate what her or his contribution to the work was in terms of both effort and substance. Care should be taken to assure that this assessment is likely to be consistent with co-authors' assessments of relative contribution.

c. The Evaluation Process

- 1) Tenure and promotion cases are evaluated at the Department, College, and University levels. At every level there is both faculty review and administrative review. Each level of review is independent. It is very rare for a negative recommendation from a Department to be overturned; however, positive recommendations are overturned when, in the eyes of the College or provost's office, the Department has not exercised appropriate standards.
- 2) In evaluating a particular case for promotion and tenure or promotion, review bodies consider an individual's assigned responsibilities and, to some extent, balance superior performance in one area against less than superior performance in another. However, there must be evidence of high quality in both teaching and research for a positive recommendation for promotion and tenure. In addition to high quality teaching and research, leadership in service roles is expected for promotion to full professor.

2. Criteria: Promotion to rank of associate professor with tenure

Below are listed the criteria related to the guidelines in the previous section. Within each of the teaching, research, and service categories, the most important criteria tend to be at the top of the list. These criteria are not exhaustive. Along with each criterion are forms of documentation, metrics or evidence possibly supplied in support of activity in each category. Again these pieces of information are not exhaustive. This section discusses criteria for promotion, with tenure, to associate professor. Further information on procedures for documenting the success of achieving these criteria is found in Section F.6.

Teaching Criteria

Documentation

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) Quality Teaching | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student evaluation of instruction• Teaching awards• Peer evaluation/visitation• Professional impact of former students• Enrollment trends in courses |
| 2) Improved/innovative curriculum or degree program advances | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New course development• Significant revisions in coursework• Distance learning and non-traditional program development |
| 3) Quality activities in pedagogy | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Textbooks authored• New innovative instructional methods (peer reviewed)• Computer assisted instruction modules• Publication in archival pedagogical journals• Teaching aids developed• Utilization in other universities• Requests for distance learning coursework by other universities or institutions |
| 4) Commitment to teaching | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of courses taught, enrollment numbers, frequency of offering, credit hours• Undergraduate versus graduate balance• Courses team-taught with faculty in other Departments in the University |

Research/Creative Scholarly Activities

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Documentation</u>
1) The creation and dissemination of quality knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Refereed archival and electronic journals• Papers presented at scientific or technical meetings• Sponsored project involvement• Peer reviewed exhibits• Research monographs authored• External peer evaluations of creative scholarly activity
2) National and international impact and recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Invited plenary addresses• Invited panel speaker• Membership on government scientific or technical review panels• Citation index analysis of authored papers• Quality of journals of published works• Professional journal editor• Chairperson or member of professional program committees, study, or working groups• Awards from professional societies or journals• Graduate student employment, success and/or awards

Service Criteria

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Documentation</u>
1) Departmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participation in standing and ad hoc committees• Advising and counseling undergraduates and graduates• Participation in and development of alumni Department activities• Participation in development of practitioner Department activities• Participation in and development of activities to help student recruitment into the Department and placement of students upon graduation• Participation in and development of fund raising activities (non-research related)• Other service as assigned
2) College and University	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participation in committees, governance, alumni activities, and other activities as assigned
3) Professional activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consulting• Service in professional society activities

3. Criteria: Promotion to the rank of professor

The significant difference in criteria between the promotion, with tenure, to the rank of associate professor and promotion to the rank of professor resides in the expectation that the faculty member will assume greater responsibility in the operational and programmatic requirements of the Department, College and University; achieve leadership positions in research, pedagogical and professional societies' activities; and accrue national and international notoriety for these activities. Therefore, the criteria listed in F.2 apply and the documentation suggested for promotion to the rank of professor should include demonstrations of increasing leadership, responsibility-taking, and international and national prestige.

4. Criteria: Regional campus faculty

As there is no regional campus faculty in the Department this section does not apply.

5. Criteria: Promotion of regular clinical track faculty

6. Procedures for Evaluations

a. Procedures Oversight Designee (W1)

Each year a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) will be selected from among the P&T Committee membership.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, in consultation with the Department Chairperson, will select the POD. The POD designee will serve a one-year term.

The primary duty of the POD is to make reasonable efforts to assure that the P&T Committee and Voting Body reviews in the Department follow written procedures governing Departmental reviews and that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner. Additional duties include:

- Completion and submission of the TIU/Departmental checklist in accordance with the format and due dates prescribed annually in W1 and W2.
- Monitoring of the review process with regards to equitable treatment for women and minority candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of under-represented groups that could bias their review.
- Development and implementation of a Departmental system of action to be taken if the POD has concerns about the review procedures. These steps should include at minimum: bringing the concern to the attention of the person or body causing the concern to seek amelioration, and; the involvement of the Chairperson in seeking his or her action in ameliorating the concern, should the POD be unable to find a solution as described in the first step.

b. Research evaluation

The procedures and documentation required for evaluating research achievements of faculty members against the criteria are specified by the University guidelines and the information contained in F, sub-sections 1.-5. and 7.-8., and therefore no further elaboration is required.

c. Teaching evaluation

With this version of the AP&T section, the teaching evaluation component moves to a more structured form and, as with the research component, consists of a mix of quantitative and subjective data. Chief among these new structures is the use of a peer review system based upon classroom visits and a portfolio submission. As this activity is not defined by any existing University or College procedure, it is explained in detail.

1) Evaluation structure and personnel

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, with the assistance of such additional full professors as may be appointed by the Chairperson of the Department, will conduct all evaluations of teaching for the purpose of promotion, granting of tenure, granting of teaching awards and special appointments requiring demonstrated high-quality teaching ability.

All members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and all additional professors appointed by the Chairperson of the Department to assist the committee will undergo suitable instruction in course evaluation techniques before participating in any review of instruction.

The overall goal of this evaluation is to determine the effectiveness of the instructor's presentation of material, his or her use of relevant instructional technologies, the instructor's response to student's questions and comments and/or peer suggestions; and the interest and participation of the students in lectures and laboratories.

2) Methods

- Student evaluation of instruction

A student evaluation of instruction shall be conducted for each offering of each course and section of a course. This Departmental course evaluation will consist of three components: (a) the University Student Evaluation of Instruction, (b) the Department's directed comments sheet, and (c) the Department subjective comments sheet. For P&T purposes, the first nine questions on the SEI will serve as the first evaluation basis. In addition, the Department comment sheets will now contain three directed questions: i) what things went well? ii) What things went wrong?, and iii) Which course objectives were met? Finally, subjective comments on the Departmental comment sheets are still considered and are essential components.

- Classroom visits

Each course to be evaluated shall be visited unannounced at least once during the second through fourth weeks of the quarter of its offering by a single member of the P&T Committee or by a single professor duly appointed by the Chairperson of the Department to assist the Committee. Up to two additional visits will be made at the discretion of the P&T Committee and/or the instructor.

- Exit interviews

Whenever possible, but especially for low (fewer than five) enrollment courses, an exit interview will be conducted by at least one member of the P&T Committee or at least one assisting professor appointed by the Chairperson of the Department of each willing student enrolled in the course.

- Written and/or oral comments from recent graduates

Whenever deemed appropriate by the P&T Committee or at the request of the Chairperson of the Department and/or the instructor, the Chairperson of the P&T Committee shall request written and/or oral comments regarding the quality and relevance of the instruction offered by individual faculty members from recent graduates.

- Portfolios

Each faculty member will maintain a portfolio for each course he or she teaches, and the P&T Committee will review this portfolio whenever the committee evaluates the faculty member's teaching. Each portfolio will contain at least

- a copy of the syllabus (please see comment on ABET format requirements at the end of this bullet);
- a description of the instructional methods used or developed, including teaching technologies employed;
- all SEIs and Department comment sheets conducted on the course;
- any self-assessment procedures used to evaluate one's performance;
- specific actions taken to improve the operation and effectiveness of the course and their results;
- samples of graded examinations, home lessons, reports, or other relevant student work;
- descriptions of efforts to improve the course content and presentation, and
- any other materials specified by the faculty, such as SET scores.

In order to provide linkage between these P&T materials and our ABET accreditation procedures, all syllabi up through the 700 level which are eligible for use in the Civil, Environmental, and Geomatics programs must be prepared and submitted in the ABET format. This includes

- i) course objectives

- ii) if relevant, the ABET criteria to be met
- iii) the schedule of topics
- iv) any required texts, computer programs and other materials to be mastered
- v) the grading policy

1) Frequency:

- Untenured Assistant and Associate Professors

Each offering of each course taught by an untenured assistant or associate faculty member shall be evaluated during the probationary period.

- Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors

At least one course taught by each tenured assistant or associate professor shall be evaluated annually. The Chairperson of the Department and/or instructor may request additional evaluations at his/her discretion.

- Professors

The Chairperson of the Department and/or instructor may request evaluations of courses taught by (full) Professors at his/her discretion.

7. Procedures and Timeline for Departmental Decisions

Following are the procedures by which the Department comes to a recommendation to the Department Chairperson concerning promotion or promotion with tenure and in turn the Chairperson makes a positive or negative recommendation to the Dean of the College of Engineering and the Provost. The various procedures and associated timelines are established to be consistent with the College and University procedures (W1, W2, W7) while timelines are established in anticipation of typical reporting requirements established annually by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs. The schedule and reporting requirements for each year are established in an annual document from the Office of Academic Affairs that is usually distributed at the end of spring quarter (W2). Therefore, the following timeline and procedures table is presented for a typical sixth year review for promotion with tenure or promotion to full professor. Typically, sixth-year reviews and promotion to full professor must be completed by the tenure-initiating unit and forwarded to the College by mid- to late-fall quarter. The procedure for fourth-year review follows the sixth-year review procedures, with the College Office due dates in mid- to late-winter quarter. Therefore, the fourth-year review tasks are the same but the timeline is shifted by approximately one quarter.

Timeline

As soon as the information on when final packages are due in the College Office is conveyed to the Department (typically no later than the end of September), the schedule for deliberations will be completed by the Department Chair and P&T Committee Chair and distributed to all the faculty. There are a number of fairly specific deadlines that fall into place once the due-date to the College is known. If “d” is the due date, then the following deadlines and the number of

days this deadline must be met before “d” is noted. The same scheduling algorithm holds when fourth-year review deadlines are known from the College.

Candidate submits final dossier to the P&T Committee.....	d-90
Evaluation letters to the P&T Committee.....	d-45
P&T Committee discussion with candidate (if requested by either the candidate or the committee) and report prepared	d-27
Dossier, letters of evaluation, and the P&T Committee report are submitted to the Voting Body for review, and other non-voting faculty comments are solicited (one-week duration).....	d-24
Voting Body discussion with candidate (if requested by the Voting Body or the candidate).....	d-17
Vote and Voting Body report prepared.....	d-17
Voting Body report submitted to the Chairperson with the P&T Committee report.....	d-16
Chairperson prepares evaluation.....	d-15
Chairperson sends the evaluation letter and the Voting Body report to the candidate for preparation of rebuttal comments (if necessary) (10 day rebuttal period required)	d-13
Candidate comments back to the Department Chairperson and Voting Body via the P&T Committee Chairperson.....	d-2
Department Chairperson and Voting Body responses to the candidate rebuttal are prepared and forwarded, if applicable, to the Department Chairperson	d-1
Department Chairperson forwards complete package to the College Office, the Candidate, and the P&T Committee Chairperson	d

Procedures in this timetable that are not self-explanatory are explained in detail as follows:

Tasks

a. Spring Quarter

- 1) The Chairperson will appoint the Promotion and Tenure Committee for the next academic year consistent with the departmental POA.
- 2) The Chairperson will distribute electronic notice of the OAA Annual Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure of Regular Faculty and for the Promotion of Regular Clinical and Auxiliary Faculty to the entire faculty.
- 3) The Chairperson will ask for expressions of interest from faculty wishing to be considered for Promotion or Promotion and Tenure. The faculty must respond in writing if they wish to be considered.
- 4) Consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-47-04.A.3 a screening process shall be undertaken by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chairperson to determine if the candidate wishing to be considered for non-mandatory review shall be considered. This screening process shall be concluded before the end of spring quarter and the determination of whether to proceed or not conveyed to the faculty

member by the last day of finals week, spring quarter. The screening process may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.

- 5) The screening process is not as rigorous as the formal reviews and a positive decision is no guarantee of success in the full formal review.
- 6) The documentation required for the screening process is described in the next section (F.8).

b. Summer Quarter

- 1) If the screening process is favorable and the faculty elects to proceed to the formal review he/she must provide to the Department Chairperson with copies to the P&T Committee Chairperson a letter of transmittal, a complete dossier prepared in accordance with University, College and Department guidelines (W2, W7) and the name, address, telephone number, e-mail address and bio-sketch of two or three nationally and internationally respected professionals who can comment upon and evaluate the substance of examples of the candidate's creative scholarly achievements. The next section defines the creative scholarly achievements.
- 2) By submission of the formal dossier to the Department, the candidate acknowledges the responsibility for preparing all pertinent documentation in the form required by the University and the submission of all further documentation in a timely fashion sufficient for the Department to meet its deadlines for submission to the College and/or the Provost's office.
- 3) By submission of the formal dossier the candidate also acknowledges familiarity with and understanding of all the current University, College and Department P&T rules and procedures. If there is any doubt about these rules the candidate must seek the most current documents from the appropriate University, College and Department sources.
- 4) The Department Chairperson will consult with Department, College and University faculty (at OSU and elsewhere) to compile additional names of internationally or nationally respected peer evaluators and shall combine these names with the candidates names.
- 5) From this list the Department Chairperson and the P&T Committee will compile a list of final evaluators that number no less than six and with no more than one-half of the letters in the final dossier being from persons suggested by the candidates. A final list of evaluators will be reviewed by the College P&T Committee for concurrence as to distribution.
- 6) On or by mid-August, the Department Chairperson will have contacted the evaluators to obtain their consent to review, which is then followed by a posted packet containing the charge to the evaluator, copies of the creative scholarly activities to be reviewed, and the dossier. The letter of charge is consistent with that suggested

in W4. Every effort should be made to have the evaluation returned by mid-to-late September at the latest.

- 7) Once letters of request have been sent to the evaluators, the application for promotion or promotion and tenure is considered official and from that point on only the candidate may stop the review. All evaluation letters received are to be included in the review package.
- 8) Once the letter of request and the associated dossier has been sent to the evaluators, no further changes, modifications, additions or deletions to the dossier can be made. Other periods in the review process are available to provide for information not included in the dossier.

c. Fall Quarter

- 1) At the beginning of fall quarter the Department Chairperson will send a letter to all Department faculty stating which faculty are being reviewed and the rank being considered. The P&T Committee membership will be re-stated and the voting body for each candidate explicitly stated by name.
- 2) As per Faculty Rule 3335-47-04.B.1, faculty eligible to vote on the review are called the Voting Body, and membership is determined as follows. All regular tenured faculty holding a 50% time or greater appointment in the Department with a rank higher than the candidates' current rank comprises the Voting Body. Department Chairpersons, tenure-initiating unit Chairpersons, College Deans, associate Deans and assistant Deans, the executive vice president and provost and the president are not eligible to be members of the Voting Body. For tenure reviews of probationary faculty who are not being considered for promotion, the Voting Body consists of 50% time or greater tenured faculty at the rank of the candidate and higher (if applicable).
- 4) After an initial review of the dossier and letters of evaluation, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet with the candidate (if either the Committee or the candidate wishes to do so) to resolve questions concerning the dossier and elaborate on the information provided in the dossier. Immediately following this meeting the Promotion and Tenure Committee will go into executive session, complete the report, affix the members' signatures and report to the faculty. The report will include a measured evaluation of the positive and negative aspects of all contributions in the dossier relative to the criteria, mission and vision statements of the Department, College and University.
- 5) The complete dossier including the Promotion and Tenure report will be made available for the Voting Body review for one week prior to the Voting Body meeting. The complete dossier, not including the Promotion and Tenure Committee report will be made available to all other regular faculty for review and transmittal of opinions to the

Promotion and Tenure Committee Chairperson. Faculty on approved professional leave will be sent a copy of the dossier.

- 6) Faculty will be expected to attend the Voting Body meeting. Those eligible to vote from the Voting Body are only those present in person at the meeting. Absentee ballots will be allowed at the option of the present Voting Body. Under extreme circumstances, approved by a majority of those present at the Voting Body meeting, absentee ballots may be allowed.
- 7) The Promotion and Tenure Committee report will form the basis of the initial motion to consider in the Voting Body meeting. Discussion, amendments, and modifications can then be considered.
- 8) After discussion of the P&T committee report and all the ensuing amendments have been moved, discussed, and voted in the Voting Body meeting, the Voting Body must vote on a final recommendation to the Department Chairperson. The votes are to be taken by secret, machine prepared ballots with either “yes,” “no,” or “abstain” votes permitted. A 60% of the majority of yes and no votes cast are required for a positive recommendation of the Voting Body to the Chairperson. The Voting Body report will be forwarded to the Chairperson as indicated in the schedule. The Voting Body report will consist of the final motion as its basis; include a measured evaluation of the positive and negative aspects of all contributions in the dossier relative to the criteria, vision and mission statements of the Department, College, and University, and; be reflective of the final outcome of the vote by the Voting Body.

8. Dossier Preparation

- a. Documentation required for the Department, College, and University reviews shall be prepared by the candidate in the form and content required by the University in its annual guidelines document (W3).
- b. The candidate is responsible for keeping the activity records required for the review process.
- c. The candidate is responsible for meeting the submission deadlines imposed by the Department, College and University.
- d. No document, such as this AP&T portion of the POA, can be exhaustive in recommending methods, types and forms of evidence as suggested in F.2. Faculty are encouraged to develop meaningful ways to document their success in meeting the criteria. Methods/metrics that are quantitative and assess not only quantity but also outcomes and impact are encouraged. Peer review is a central component of any subjective or quality-based metrics and should be incorporated early-on in developing data for submission that are either new in form or non-traditional.
- e. Questions on format, content, and suitability of metrics should be raised with the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee well in advance of the first submission date for materials.

9. Hypothetical Cases

The following sketches serve to provide guidance to the candidates for Promotion and Tenure and the faculty as to how a submission might be evaluated.

a. Successful Cases

A case that would very likely receive a positive recommendation for promotion and tenure would have all of the following characteristics.

- 1) Either consistently high quality teaching as assessed by both students and peers, or steadily improving teaching such that excellence has been attained by the time of the promotion and tenure review.
- 2) A substantial body of focused, high quality scholarly work that is disseminated in venues considered to be top ranking in the field and is judged to have had impact on the field by internal and external evaluators; evidence of considerable work in progress.
- 3) A pattern of cooperative interaction with colleagues to further the goals of the Department and evidence of emerging professional leadership.

A case that would very likely receive a positive recommendation for promotion to the rank of full professor would have all of the following characteristics.

- 1) A record of consistently high quality teaching including the training of a number of successful doctoral (or other terminal degree) students.
- 2) Continued steady scholarly productivity since the last promotion culminating in a substantial body of high quality, focused work judged to have made a major impact on the field.
- 3) A national and, if relevant, international reputation as a leading scholar in the field.
- 4) Evidence of substantial professional leadership e.g. Chairperson of major committees within the University, editorships, leadership positions in professional organizations, recognition as leading expert in application of professional expertise to resolution of public problems. For promotion to this rank, *superior* performance in one area can offset less than superior performance in another as long as performance in other areas is at least good.

b. Negative Cases

A case that would very likely receive a negative recommendation for promotion and tenure (and perhaps nonrenewable prior to the sixth year) would have one or more of the following characteristics.

- 1) Consistently unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching coupled with no evidence of effort to improve or with evidence of unsuccessful efforts to improve.
- 2) Minimal quantity of scholarly output or scholarly output (regardless of quantity) that receives, at best, mixed reviews as to its quality, focus, and/or impact.
- 3) In fields in which external funds are essential to carry out research, failure to establish ability to obtain such funds.
- 4) Lack of congruence between the needs of the Department and the faculty member's work. This may come about because the faculty member changes directions after hire, because the Department foci change and the faculty member doesn't or can't change accordingly, or because the faculty member consistently refuses to work productively with colleagues or is even a destructive force within the unit.

A case that would very likely receive a negative recommendation for promotion to the rank of full professor (assuming the Department was even willing to carry out a review) would have one or more of the following characteristics:

- 1) Teaching of average quality at best.
- 2) Few or no graduate students advised to completion when circumstances are such that it would be reasonable to expect such activity.
- 3) Limited scholarly productivity since last promotion.
- 4) Few or poor quality service contributions.

c. Marginal Cases

A marginal case for promotion to associate professor with tenure that would warrant much discussion and have an uncertain outcome would have one or more of the following characteristics.

- 1) Poorly documented teaching.
- 2) Mixed assessments of teaching; e.g., substantial variations in evaluations (peer and/or student) from quarter to quarter or level of course.
- 3) A positively evaluated but very small body of scholarly work (unless the quality is unquestionably superior).
- 4) A body of positively evaluated work (usually but not necessarily small) that emerges only late in the probationary period (unless the nature of the work precluded a different pattern of production), especially if accompanied by lack of evidence of substantial work in progress.
- 5) A body of work adequate in quantity but of questionable quality

A marginal case for promotion to full professor would have one or more of the above characteristics associated with marginal promotion and tenure cases. Additional indicators associated with marginal cases for promotion to full professor include

- 1) The existence of a substantial body of scholarly work but lack of evidence of focus and/or lack of evidence that the faculty member has made a major impact on the field.
- 2) Substantial service contributions but lack of leadership roles.

These cases are *not* to be taken as a recapitulation of the specific criteria for the Department. Rather they summarize patterns of accomplishments (or lack thereof) that would be likely to yield the designated outcome at the various review levels.

G. Appeals

It is the policy of The Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in these rules, supplemented by additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and Colleges. If a candidate believes that a non-renewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in rule (3335-5-05) of the Administrative Code.

H. Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-47-05B (W1) 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 review. The text of the rule follows.

Seventh year reviews—Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, a tenure-initiating unit may petition the Dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor that has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculties of the unit and the Chairperson must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular University review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the Dean concurs with the tenure initiating unit's petition, the Dean shall in turn petition the provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the non-renewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of

employment is that stated in the letter of non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by his or her tenure initiating unit, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review (3335-47-05B).

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science

The Ohio State University
470 Hitchcock Hall
2070 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Oliver G. McGee III, Ph.D., M.B.A.
Professor and Chair

June 12, 2003
(as approved in faculty meetings June 7 and June 12, 2002,
revised per request of Provost dated June 2, 2003)