

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

Table of Contents

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	I Preamble	3
7	II Department Mission	3
8	III Definitions.....	4
9	A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
10	1 Tenure-track Faculty	4
11	2 Clinical Faculty	4
12	3 Research Faculty	4
13	4 Conflict of Interest	5
14	5 Minimum Composition	5
15	C Quorum.....	5
16	D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
17	1 Appointment	5
18	2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal.....	5
19	IV Appointments.....	6
20	A Criteria	6
21	1 Tenure-track Faculty	6
22	2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus	7
23	3 Clinical Faculty	7
24	Assistant Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering.	7
25	Associate Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering and Professor of Practice in	
26	Biomedical Engineering.....	7
27	4 Research Faculty	7
28	5 Associated Faculty	8
29	6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	8
30	B Procedures	9
31	1 Tenure-track Faculty	9
32	2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus	10
33	3 Clinical Faculty	10
34	4 Research Faculty	11
35	5 Transfer from the Tenure-track.....	11
36	6 Associated Faculty	11
37	7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	11
38	V Annual Review Procedures.....	12
39	A Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	12
40	1 Regional Campus Faculty	12
41	2 Fourth-Year Review.....	13
42	3 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period.....	13
43	B Tenured Faculty.....	13
44	C Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus	13

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1	D Clinical Faculty	14
2	E Research Faculty	14
3	F Associated Faculty	14
4	VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	14
5	A Criteria	15
6	B Procedures	15
7	C Documentation	15
8	1 Teaching	16
9	2 Scholarship	16
10	3 Service	16
11	VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	16
12	A Criteria	16
13	1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	17
14	2 Promotion to Professor	20
15	Teaching	20
16	Scholarship	21
17	Service	22
18	4 Regional Campus Faculty	22
19	5 Clinical Faculty	22
20	6 Research Faculty	23
21	B Procedures	23
22	1 Candidate Responsibilities	23
23	2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	24
24	3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	25
25	4 Department Chair Responsibilities	25
26	5 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	26
27	6 External Evaluations	26
28	C Documentation	27
29	1 Teaching	28
30	2 Scholarship	28
31	3 Service	29
32	VIII Appeals	29
33	IX Seventh-Year Reviews	29
34	X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	29
35	A Student Evaluation of Teaching	29
36	B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	30
37	Appendix A: BME Peer Teaching Evaluation Form:	32
38	Appendix B: Timeline Guide:	34
39	Tenure cases:	34
40	4 th Year Review cases:	35
41	Annual Review: probationary and tenured faculty members:	36
42		

1 **I Preamble**

2
3 This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty
4 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in
5 Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook
6 (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to
7 which the department and its faculty are subject.
8

9 Should those rules and policies change, the department will follow the new rules and policies until such
10 time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed,
11 and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the
12 department chair.
13

14 This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it
15 may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the
16 missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty
17 promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the
18 Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the
19 responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to
20 departmental mission and criteria.
21

22 The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01
23 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the
24 responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards
25 established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) and other standards specific to this
26 department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to
27 maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.
28

29 Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of
30 discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal opportunity
31 (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).
32

33 **II Department Mission**

34 **Mission:**

35 *Our mission is to promote learning and discovery*
36 *that integrate engineering and life sciences*
37 *for the advancement of human health.*
38

39 **Vision:**

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

- 42 • The distinctive educational opportunities for its students and the outstanding achievements of its
43 alumni,
- 44 • Faculty and staff excellence and opportunities for continuing professional development,
- 45 • Collaborative research with global impact on improving human health, and
- 46 • Service to the field of biomedical engineering and the community.
47
48
49
50

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

- 4 • Collaboration, collegiality, and respect
- 5 • Discoveries and Innovations that improve human health
- 6 • Integrity and ethical behavior
- 7 • Lifelong learning

8
9 **III Definitions**

10
11 **A Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

12
13 **1 Tenure-track Faculty**

14
15 The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure track faculty consists of all tenure-track
16 departmental faculty. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members
17 eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

18
19 The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and
20 promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate
21 whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and
22 associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

23
24 For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides
25 in the department, excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the
26 college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

27
28 **2 Clinical Faculty**

29
30 The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of clinical faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose
31 tenure resides in the department and all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in the department.
32 For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the
33 rank under consideration.

34
35 The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion
36 of clinical faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in
37 the department and all nonprobationary clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose primary
38 appointment is in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate
39 deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

40
41 **3 Research Faculty**

42
43 The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of research faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose
44 tenure resides in the department, all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in the department, and
45 all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the department. For an appointment at senior rank, a
46 second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

47
48 The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion
49 reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure
50 resides in the department, all nonprobationary clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose

1 primary appointment is in the department, and all nonprobationary research faculty of higher rank than
2 the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department excluding the department chair, the dean
3 and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the
4 president.

6 **4 Conflict of Interest**

8 A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable
9 close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some
10 way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation
11 advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's
12 work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50%
13 of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion
14 review of that candidate.

16 **5 Minimum Composition**

18 The minimum composition of the committee is three full professors. If there are not three full Professors
19 with their TIU in Biomedical Engineering available, and in keeping with past policy, up to three tenured
20 full professors holding courtesy or joint appointments in the department will be appointed to undertake
21 the reviews, as needed to reach the minimum composition of the committee. If none are available, the
22 Department Chair will consult with the Dean to appoint one or more full professors from other TIUs to
23 serve on the BME committee to ensure the minimum composition of three full professors for a review.

25 **C Quorum**

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

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

35 **D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

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

41 Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

43 **1 Appointment**

45 A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the
46 votes cast are positive.

48 **2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal**

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

IV Appointments

A Criteria

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

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

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.

Assistant Professor. An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank 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 (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.

1 **2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus**
2

3 As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria
4 for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for
5 Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and
6 quality.
7

8 **3 Clinical Faculty**
9

10 Appointment of clinical faculty entails a three-, four- or five-year contract. The initial contract is
11 probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is
12 also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the
13 department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the
14 penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7
15 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).
16

17 In Biomedical Engineering, Clinical faculty members are referred to as “Professors of Practice.”
18

19 **Instructor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering.** Appointment is normally made at the rank of
20 instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree at the time of
21 appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the
22 instructor level is limited to a four-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed
23 requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the
24 contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the
25 position itself will continue.
26

27 **Assistant Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering.** An earned doctorate is the minimum
28 requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor of practice in Biomedical Engineering.
29 Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.
30

31 **Associate Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering and Professor of Practice in Biomedical**
32 **Engineering.** Appointment at the rank of associate professor of practice in biomedical engineering or
33 professor of practice in biomedical engineering requires that the individual have the required
34 licensure/certification in his/her specialty, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching,
35 professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.
36

37 **4 Research Faculty**
38

39 Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary,
40 with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no
41 presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department
42 wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate
43 year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7
44 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).
45

46 **Research Assistant Professor.** Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the
47 individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to
48 sustain an independent, externally funded research program.
49

1 **Research Associate Professor and Research Professor.** Appointment at the rank of research associate
2 professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the
3 department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.
4

5 **5 Associated Faculty**

6
7 Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple weeks to assist with a focused project, a
8 semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-
9 term planning and retention. With the exception of visiting faculty, associated faculty may be
10 reappointed.
11

12 **Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.** Adjunct appointments
13 may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give
14 academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees,
15 for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the
16 criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but
17 not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.
18

19 **Lecturer.** Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a
20 field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction
21 is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the
22 criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed
23 one year.
24

25 **Senior Lecturer.** Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a
26 doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide
27 high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with
28 documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial
29 appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year.
30

31 **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.** Appointment at tenure-
32 track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1 – 49% FTE) or uncompensated
33 (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for
34 appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for
35 promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.
36

37 **Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor.**
38 Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members
39 on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that
40 position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the
41 criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or
42 promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.
43

44 **6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

45
46 Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track, clinical, or research
47 faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy)
48 appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate
49 student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A
50 courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank
51 recognized.

1
2 **B Procedures**
3

4 See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in
5 the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) for
6 information on the following topics:
7

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

13
14 **1 Tenure-track Faculty**
15

16 A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track
17 positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs
18 in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent
19 update of A Guide to Effective Searches (www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf).
20

21 Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:
22

23 The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This
24 approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of
25 expertise.
26

27 The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field
28 of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department.
29

30 The search committee:
31

- 32 • Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that
33 vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
34
- 35 • Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings
36 (formerly known as the "green sheet") through the Office of Human Resources Employment
37 Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval.
38 The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the
39 search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with
40 respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be
41 stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any
42 applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
43
- 44 • Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations
45 and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign
46 nationals, the search committee must advertising using at least one 30-day online ad in a national
47 professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency
48 ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of
49 foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment
50 to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally professional

1 journal.

- 2
- 3 • Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of
4 those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this
5 judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the
6 department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the
7 faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications
8 already received, cancel the search for the time being).
- 9

10 On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups,
11 including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In
12 addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship, and
13 teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates
14 interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

15
16 Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet to discuss perceptions and
17 preferences, and to vote on each candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each
18 candidate to the department chair.

19
20 If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the
21 proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the
22 appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of
23 the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair.

24
25 In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the
26 department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including
27 compensation, are determined by the department chair.

28
29 Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the
30 Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent
31 residency status. The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in
32 assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

33 34 **2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus**

35
36 The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track
37 faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with the department chair to reach agreement on
38 the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one
39 representative from the department.

40
41 Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, department
42 eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional
43 requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires
44 agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations
45 with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the
46 regional campus dean.

47 48 **3 Clinical Faculty**

49

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1 Searches for clinical faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception
2 that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus interview is on clinical/professional practice rather
3 than scholarship, and exceptions to a national search only requires approval by the college dean.
4

5 **4 Research Faculty**

6
7 Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception
8 that during the on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class, and exceptions to a
9 national search only requires approval by the college dean.
10

11 **5 Transfer from the Tenure-track**

12
13 Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a clinical or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist.
14 Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean,
15 and the executive vice president and provost.
16

17 The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the
18 individual's career goals and activities have changed.
19

20 Transfers from a clinical appointment and from a research appointment to the tenure-track are not
21 permitted. Clinical faculty members and research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions
22 and compete in regular national searches for such positions.
23

24 **6 Associated Faculty**

25
26 The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the
27 department chair in consultation with the department Executive Committee.
28

29 Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any
30 faculty member in the department and is decided by the department chair in consultation with the
31 department Executive Committee.
32

33 Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or
34 longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the
35 appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for
36 one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.
37

38 Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester or annual basis.
39 After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year
40 appointment may be offered.
41

42 Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures
43 for tenure-track faculty (see Appointment Criteria above), with the exception that the review does not
44 proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to
45 the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.
46

47 **7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

48
49 Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track,
50 clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the
51 uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1 faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer
2 of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine
3 whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a
4 vote at a regular meeting.

5 6 **V Annual Review Procedures**

7
8 The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review
9 Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

10
11 The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship,
12 and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any
13 additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where
14 relevant.

15
16 The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described
17 under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the department chair no later than
18 the final day of autumn semester classes.

19
20 The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) to include a
21 reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04
22 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any
23 material therein for inclusion in the file.

24 25 **A Probationary Tenure-track Faculty**

26
27 Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair, who meets with the
28 faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written
29 evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

30
31 If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The
32 department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for
33 another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written
34 comments on the review. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if
35 received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the
36 cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she
37 chooses).

38
39 If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule
40 3335-6-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the
41 complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal
42 or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

43 44 **1 Regional Campus Faculty**

45
46 Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus
47 on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In
48 the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the
49 department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and
50 reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

51

1 **2 Fourth-Year Review**

2
3 During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the
4 mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the
5 department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary
6 appointment.

7
8 External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine
9 that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's
10 scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise
11 capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

12
13 The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty
14 votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

15
16 The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department
17 chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written
18 evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the
19 conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04
20 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of
21 whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

22
23 **3 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period**

24
25 Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary
26 tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and
27 guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook
28 (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>).

29
30 **B Tenured Faculty**

31
32 Associate professors are reviewed by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty
33 member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on
34 these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. Once there is a group of
35 3 or more full professors with their TIU in Biomedical, associate professors will be reviewed annually by
36 the professors, who submit a written performance review to the department chair along with comments on
37 the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The department chair conducts an independent
38 assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals;
39 and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on
40 the review.

41
42 Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty
43 member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on
44 these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

45
46 **C Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus**

47
48 Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on
49 teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the
50 event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1 department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and
2 reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

3
4 **D Clinical Faculty**

5
6 The annual review process for clinical probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for
7 tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively.

8
9 In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, the department chair must
10 determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not
11 continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of
12 employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) must be
13 observed.

14
15 If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the
16 penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This
17 review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External
18 letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

19
20 **E Research Faculty**

21
22 The annual review process for research probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for
23 tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty.

24
25 In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must
26 determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the
27 faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The
28 standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) must be observed.

29
30 If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the
31 penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This
32 review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External
33 letters of evaluation are **not required**. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

34
35 **F Associated Faculty**

36
37 Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before
38 reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the
39 faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's
40 recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the
41 department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

42
43 Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the
44 department chair, or designee. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets
45 with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October
46 15 of the final year of the appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department
47 chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

48
49 **VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards**
50

1 **A Criteria**

2
3 Except when the university dictates any type of across the board salary increase, all funds for annual
4 salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent
5 possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

6
7 On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize
8 non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such
9 payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

10
11 Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with the same
12 criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the
13 past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-
14 quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will
15 necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are
16 likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

17
18 Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will
19 receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating
20 circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

21
22 **B Procedures**

23
24 The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean,
25 who may modify these recommendations. -Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than
26 percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal
27 distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department
28 chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and
29 unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

30
31 Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the department chair
32 should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since
33 increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

34
35 **C Documentation**

36
37 The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation be submitted to
38 the department chair no later than one week following the end of Spring semester classes.

- 39
40
- 41 • updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Volume 3
(<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>)
 - 42 • updated short biography
 - 43 • updated summary of teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments
 - 44 • updated department's Part 1 summary of accomplishments, including scholarship and service,
45 follow-up from the previous year's recommendations and goals, and specific plans for the coming
46 year (generally due by mid-April for the previous *calendar* year)
 - 47 • updated department's Part 2 summary of teaching accomplishments, SEI results, and overall self-
48 evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service and plans for the coming year (generally due by
49 early May for the previous *academic* year)
- 50

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

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

4
5 Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual
6 review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is
7 unlikely to be candid.

8
9 The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 12 months.

10
11 **1 Teaching**

12
13 Cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by
14 the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.

15
16 Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program
17 (details provided in section X of this document).

18
19 On request, copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication
20 will be provided. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter
21 from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no
22 further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual
23 review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.

24
25 Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

26
27 **2 Scholarship**

28
29 On request, copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for
30 publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the
31 paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

32
33 Documentation of grants and contracts received.

34
35 Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate (published reviews including publications
36 where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

37
38 **3 Service**

39
40 Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the
41 dossier.

42
43 **VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

44
45 **A Criteria**

46
47 Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) provides the following context for promotion and tenure
48 and promotion reviews:

49
50 *In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable*
51 *flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and*

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

11 **1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

12
13 Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) provides the following general criteria for promotion to
14 associate professor with tenure:

15
16 *The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on*
17 *convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar,*
18 *and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-*
19 *quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which*
20 *the faculty member is assigned and to the university.*

21
22 Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

23
24 The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and
25 judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to
26 the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

27
28 Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting
29 weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately
30 handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are
31 held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's
32 primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate
33 teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by
34 excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's
35 responsibilities.

36
37 Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical
38 conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the National Society of Professional Engineers
39 (<http://www.nspe.org/resources/ethics/code-ethics>).

40
41 The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are expected of
42 faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate
43 professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a
44 senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

45 **Teaching**

46
47
48 For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- 49 • Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and
50 demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
51

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

- 1 • Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction,
2 and enthusiasm
- 3 • Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and
4 other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- 5 • Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity,
6 and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- 7 • Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- 8 • Treated students with respect and courtesy
- 9 • Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs
- 10 • Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate
11 student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- 12 • Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching

13
14 In general, each faculty member in Biomedical Engineering is expected to teach courses at both the
15 undergraduate and graduate levels in consistence with their individual expertise and the needs of the
16 departmental programs. Differences among the different technical areas of the Department, Departmental
17 needs, scheduling matters, enrollment considerations, and other factors are expected to impact the degree
18 of diversity represented in the candidate faculty member's teaching history. Since some of these factors
19 may lie beyond the candidate's control, the candidate's teaching record should exhibit variety subject to
20 these constraints.

21
22 The assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the key areas listed above comes primarily from
23 student responses to the SEI and from peer assessment visits. (The format for peer assessments in
24 Biomedical Engineering is included in the Appendix.) An analysis of the SEI responses will be done in
25 comparison to the statistics of other faculty in the College of Engineering. Conclusions about teaching
26 effectiveness are based on this comparison as well as the peer assessments.

27
28 In addition to the assessment of teaching, the candidate is expected to show evidence of development as
29 an effective mentor of graduate and undergraduate students in research. It is expected that there will be a
30 transient period when the candidate establishes the necessary facilities to support his/her scholarship,
31 establishes his/her identity among graduate students, and attracts student researchers. It is expected that
32 the candidate would have guided several M.S. students to the completion of their theses, and that he/she
33 would have some Ph.D. students well along in their programs of study. It is also expected that the
34 candidate would be serving, or have served in, a number of thesis/examination committees for graduate
35 students advised by other faculty members, especially in the area of the candidate's research interest.

36
37 **Scholarship**

38
39 For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- 40
41 • Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused,
42 contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited
43 or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the
44 body of work are considered:
 - 45 ○ Quality, impact, quantity
 - 46 ○ Unique contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work
 - 47 ○ Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues.
 - 48 Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than
 - 49 conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and
 - 50 original works more than edited works.

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

- 1 ○ While collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry,
2 the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly
3 described to permit accurate assessment.
- 4 ○ Generation of intellectual property, filing patents, and/or associated commercialization
5 activities.
- 6 • A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive
7 peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality
8 indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are
9 weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a
10 means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review.
- 11 • A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external
12 evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research
13 papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers'
14 publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from
15 one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and
16 international conferences.
- 17
- 18 • Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full
19 and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of
20 graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.
- 21

22 The successful candidate is expected to present the evidence of the following characteristics for a well-
23 developed research program: the clear establishment of a research identity; the demonstrated ability to
24 develop graduate students as apprentice researchers and to advise them effectively through the program;
25 the ability to identify and secure funding at some reasonable level to support these research activities and
26 graduate students; and consistency. There must be clear and compelling evidence that the candidate has
27 actively undertaken the building of a research program and will continue to build and maintain that
28 program for the foreseeable future.

29

30 The quality and quantity of scientific publications in refereed archival journals will be considered in the
31 evaluation. The quality of the contribution will be regarded highly, while the quality of the journal will
32 be considered as a factor. For a variety of reasons, it is difficult to define a specific number of expected
33 archival publications that would be deemed satisfactory. It is both expected and appropriate that the
34 candidate will include publications co-authored with the doctoral advisor. However, some of the archival
35 publications should be authored by the candidate with his/her own research team members, including
36 graduate students.

37

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

45

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

1
2 **Service**
3

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

- 5
6
 - 7 • Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others
 - 8 • Made useful contributions to the profession

9

10 **2 Promotion to Professor**

11
12 Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) establishes the following general criteria for promotion
13 to the rank of professor:

14
15 *Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member*
16 *has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship*
17 *that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.*
18

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

23
24 For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for senior faculty, for
25 students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities,
26 with exceptional performance in these responsibilities required.

27
28 When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and
29 international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

30
31 In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned
32 responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires,
33 heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another.

34
35 In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others
36 established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

37
38 **Teaching**

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

43 The candidate is expected to have:

- 44
 - 45 ○ A record of consistently effective classroom teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses, with particular emphasis on the preceding five years. Measures of quality, which may be used to demonstrate excellence, are the successful use of innovative techniques or third-party evaluations of classroom performance to improve teaching effectiveness, teaching awards for classroom instruction, and variety of courses taught.
 - 46 ○ A record of effective mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in research. The candidate shall have graduated at least some Ph.D. students, and usually, a greater number of M.S. students. Consistency in the area of mentoring students over the period

47
48
49
50
51

1 of interest is important, a steady stream of students being indicative of a continuing and
2 sustained effort. It is also expected that, at the time of consideration for promotion, the
3 candidate will have a number of Ph.D. and M.S. students at various stages of their
4 programs of study.

- 5 ○ A record of significant contributions in the area of curriculum development, in the form
6 of development and/or modifications of courses and labs.
- 7 ○ A record of meaningful and consistent involvement in graduate exams, theses, and
8 dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor.

9
10 **Scholarship**

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

- 15 ○ A record of acknowledged excellence in the conduct of scholarly research. The
16 excellence of the candidate's research efforts and scholastic accomplishments must be
17 recognized nationally and internationally by acknowledged scholars in his/her area. Such
18 a record is usually accompanied by a coherent research program, which has produced
19 important results relating to one or a few central research issues of acknowledged
20 significance in the academic community. Furthermore, consistency of the research effort
21 is important as well, it being highly desirable that the candidate maintain an active
22 research program at the time of consideration for promotion and may include generation
23 of significant intellectual property, filing patents and/or associated commercialization
24 activities.
- 25 ○ A record of consistency and excellence in contributions to the technical literature,
26 especially during the period after the last promotion. The candidate shall have produced a
27 significant body of publications in refereed journals, particularly in high quality archival
28 journals appropriate to the research area, refereed conference proceedings, book chapters
29 and other forms. Other measures of the quality, which may be used, include invited talks
30 and research seminars given by the candidate. It is difficult to place absolute numerical
31 requirements on the publication record, given the wide variability in acceptance rates,
32 prestige and visibility within journals and other publications. However, it is essential that
33 the publication record be commensurate with a sustained record of research, and
34 dissemination of research results, over the duration of the candidate's research career.
35 The publication record in archival journals is of primary importance for promotion to
36 Professor.
- 37 ○ A record of excellence involving graduate students in research. This aspect of
38 research/scholarship overlaps with the mentoring aspect of the candidate's teaching
39 performance, which has been described previously in the document. In addition to the
40 comments relating to graduation of Ph.D. and M.S. students as part of such mentoring, it
41 is expected that the candidate will have co-authored a number of publications with his/her
42 graduate students, and that he/she will have facilitated research presentations by graduate
43 students at technical conferences. Awards and honors secured by graduate students, such
44 as best paper/presentation awards and university/national fellowships based on research
45 progress and results, reflect positively upon the candidate's involvement of graduate
46 students in research, and will be so treated. Also, honors and fellowships awarded to
47 Ph.D. students after graduation, as well as placement at prestigious institutions, will be
48 similarly treated.
- 49 ○ A record of sustained funding at a reasonable level to support the research activities of
50 the candidate. Each faculty member is expected to create and maintain an externally
51 supported research program. The funding history of the candidate, including the seeking

1 of the funding, should be consistent with this requirement, especially for the period since
2 the last promotion.

- 3 ○ In addition to demonstrating a record of excellence in the different areas of
4 research/scholarship, the candidate should provide evidence of ongoing research activity
5 in the form of papers in review for publication, continuing grants/contracts, submitted
6 proposals, and Ph.D./M.S. students at different stages in their programs of study.
7

8 **Service**

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

- 11 ○ A record of effective service to professional societies, and organizations such as funding
12 agencies, often in leadership roles. Such service may take the form of editorships of
13 prestigious journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings; organization
14 and/or Chairing of sessions at/of technical conferences or workshops; committee
15 Chairmanships in/of societies and federal agency committees; service as reviewer of
16 proposals for governmental funding agencies; and as reviewer of conference and journal
17 papers.
18 ○ A record of effective service to the Department, college, and university, again involving
19 leadership roles. Service in Departmental committees in leadership roles is expected of
20 the candidate. Service to the Department may also take the form of faculty advising of
21 student groups and organizations by the candidate. It is expected and natural that
22 candidates for promotion at this level would have had significantly more opportunities for
23 service to the college and university, and would have availed themselves of such
24 opportunities.
25 ○ Included as part of the service to be expected in the department are efforts to foster and
26 lead the dedication, cooperation, professionalism, ethical behavior, and the collegial
27 attitude of the faculty.
28

29 **4 Regional Campus Faculty**

30
31 The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to
32 serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional
33 campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the
34 quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. Recognizing that the character and quantity of
35 scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the
36 weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless
37 expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.
38

39 **5 Clinical Faculty**

40 All clinical faculty must:

- 41 ○ be engaged in teaching, the development of the departmental and College academic
42 program, and the mentoring of students
43 ○ contribute to the scholarly mission of the Department of Biomedical Engineering, the
44 College of Engineering, and University
45 ○ contribute to service in the Department of Biomedical Engineering, and are strongly
46 encouraged to contribute to service to the College and the University, and at the national
47 level in Biomedical Engineering
48

49 The teaching activities of clinical faculty must be consistent with the rationale for having clinical faculty
50 in the College; these consist of courses that involve the practice of engineering. The scholarly emphasis of
51 clinical faculty is expected to be different from that of tenure-track and research faculty; clinical faculty

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1 would be more engaged in activities dealing with the state of the practice of engineering, while tenure-
2 track and research faculty would be more engaged in activities that advance the state of the art and
3 science of engineering. The venues appropriate for dissemination of such scholarly contributions
4 therefore may be very different from those expected of tenure-track faculty. Scholarly and professional
5 service activities of clinical faculty would be expected to emphasize interaction with industry rather than
6 with a research community.

7
8 **Promotion to Assistant Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering.** For promotion to assistant
9 professor of in biomedical engineering, a faculty member must complete his/her doctoral degree and meet
10 the required licensure/certification in his or her specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching,
11 professional practice and service.

12
13 **Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering.** For promotion to associate
14 professor of in biomedical engineering, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence
15 as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in
16 professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching
17 and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for
18 promotion to associate professor-clinical are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with
19 tenure. The candidate should have a record of scholarly activity that contributes to the mission of the
20 department. Scholarship activity should focus on production and dissemination of scholarly materials
21 pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

22
23 **Promotion to Professor of Practice in Biomedical Engineering.** For promotion to professor of in
24 biomedical engineering, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and
25 increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional
26 practice; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination
27 of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

28 29 **6 Research Faculty**

30
31 **Promotion to Research Associate Professor.** For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty
32 member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment
33 devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged
34 by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer
35 reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

36
37 **Promotion to Research Professor.** For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a
38 national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with
39 demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required, along with
40 demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

41 42 **B Procedures**

43
44 The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with
45 those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) and the Office Academic Affairs
46 annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the
47 [Policies and Procedures Handbook](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html) (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). The following sections, which
48 state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the department.

49 50 **1 Candidate Responsibilities**

51

1 The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:
2

- 3 • To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs
4 guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist
5 without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic
6 Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.
7
- 8 • To submit a copy of the department's APT Document that was in effect at the time of the
9 candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he
10 wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted
11 when the dossier is submitted to the department.
12
- 13 • To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the
14 Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names,
15 but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names,
16 providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is
17 justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
18

19 **2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities**

20
21 The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:
22

- 23 • To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- 24 • To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-
25 mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such
26 a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review
27 requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request
28 must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - 29 ○ The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty
30 member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for
31 a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required
32 documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory
33 review.
 - 34 ○ A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty
35 Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of
36 required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the
37 following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that
38 such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - 39 ○ Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are
40 citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-
41 mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an
42 untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or
43 permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to
44 lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by
45 this department.
 - 46 ○ A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the
47 eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a
48 positive recommendation during the review itself.
- 49 • Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the
50 promotion and tenure review process as described below.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. 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 full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

4 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

- 1
- 2 • To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review
- 3 by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be
- 4 discussed and voted.
- 5 • To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member
- 6 has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- 7 • To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed
- 8 and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
- 9 • **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for
- 10 each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and
- 11 recommendation.
- 12 • To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the
- 13 recommendation of the committee.
- 14 • To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
- 15 ○ Of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
- 16 ○ Of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and
- 17 department chair
- 18 ○ Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days
- 19 from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter
- 20 is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating
- 21 whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- 22 • To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in
- 23 the dossier.
- 24 • To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case
- 25 of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative
- 26 recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- 27 To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of
- 28 candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this
- 29 material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation,
- 30 to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.
- 31

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

34 **5 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty**

35
36 Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process
37 established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review
38 focuses on teaching and service.

39
40 The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional
41 campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for
42 the Columbus campus faculty.

43 **6 External Evaluations**

44
45
46 External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which
47 scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews,
48 all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion
49 reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical faculty unless
50

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1 the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek
2 external evaluations for a clinical faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting
3 with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
4

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

- 6
- 7 • Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance,
8 if relevant) who can give an “arms’ length” evaluation of the research record and is not a close
9 personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the
10 candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of
11 accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from
12 full professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor
13 seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come
14 from associate professors.
- 15 • Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A
16 letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to
17 perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an
18 evaluator on the merits of the case.
19

20 Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received,
21 more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of June prior to the
22 review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters
23 result from the first round of requests.
24

25 As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee,
26 the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for
27 credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04
28 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be
29 written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate
30 do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier
31 contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.
32

33 The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at
34 <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampleddocuments.html>, for letters requesting external evaluations.
35

36 Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with
37 external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should
38 initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such
39 communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what,
40 if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that
41 letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural
42 lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.
43

44 All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier. If concerns arise
45 about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the department's written evaluations
46 or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.
47

48 **C Documentation**

49

50 As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate
51 dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure

1 Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate
2 bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.
3

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

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

13 14 **1 Teaching**

15
16 The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present.
17 For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is
18 less, to present. Examples of documentation include:

- 19 • Cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries
20 prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class
- 21 • Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching
22 program (details provided in the Appendix to this document)
- 23 • Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for
24 publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a
25 letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final
26 form with no further revisions needed.
- 27 • Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - 28 ○ Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate
29 research
 - 30 ○ Mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - 31 ○ Extension and continuing education instruction
 - 32 ○ Involvement in curriculum development
 - 33 ○ Awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - 34 ○ Presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - 35 ○ Adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- 36 • Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

37 38 39 **2 Scholarship**

40
41 The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present.
42 For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of
43 documentation include:

- 44 • Copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers
45 accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher
46 stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further
47 revisions needed.
 - 48 • Documentation of grants and contracts received
- 49

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

- 1 • Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including
- 2 publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been
- 3 submitted)
- 4 • Scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including
- 5 ○ Documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus
- 6 including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving
- 7 images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
- 8 ○ Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
- 9 ○ List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

10
11 **3 Service**

12
13 The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present.
14 For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of
15 documentation include:

- 16
17 • Service activities as listed in the core dossier including
- 18 ○ Involvement with professional journals and professional societies
- 19 ○ Consultation activity with industry, education, or government
- 20 ○ Clinical services
- 21 ○ Administrative service to department
- 22 ○ Administrative service to college
- 23 ○ Administrative service to university and Student Life
- 24 ○ Advising to student groups and organizations
- 25 ○ Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
- 26 • Any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that
- 27 enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

28
29 **VIII Appeals**

30
31 Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative
32 promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule
33 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).

34
35 Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty
36 member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written
37 policies and procedures.

38
39 **IX Seventh-Year Reviews**

40
41 Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh
42 Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

43
44 **X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

45
46 **A Student Evaluation of Teaching**

47
48 Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) is required in every course offered in this department
49 as are the BME departments course evaluation results. Faculty members should choose a day late in the
50 semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to
51 complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during

1 the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the
2 feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that
3 can be taken into account in future teaching.
4

5 At the end of each semester, faculty are required to complete the template and attend the “Course
6 Roundup” retreat that includes discussion of the syllabus, areas of concern, ideas for addressing areas of
7 concern, and the outcome of interventions that have been implemented. Further, content appropriate for
8 ABET assessment and accreditation are discussed, and attention to issues for the overall undergraduate
9 and graduate curricula are discussed.
10

11 **B Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

12
13 The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching
14 process.
15

16 Annually the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee of
17 a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without
18 overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment
19 possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in
20 order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no
21 presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being
22 reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.
23

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

- 25 • To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty at least once per year
26 during the first two years of service, and at least twice more during the remainder of the
27 probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which
28 the faculty member is assigned
- 29 • To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary associate professors
30 with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is
31 assigned over a three year period
- 32 • To review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary professors with the goal of
33 assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during
34 the year of the review
- 35 • To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently
36 scheduled for review.
- 37 • To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that
38 individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the
39 faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review
40 took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty
41 seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the
42 Advancement of Teaching (www.ucat.osu.edu).
43

44 Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific
45 aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member and may or may not include class
46 visitations
47

48 Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive
49 and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction
50 materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1 is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has identified in
2 consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for
3 the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the
4 peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

5
6 In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on
7 such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality
8 and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the
9 approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer
10 meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair,
11 copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer
12 may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.
13
14

1
2 **Appendix A: BME Peer Teaching Evaluation Form:**

3
4 **Peer Evaluation of Teaching**
5 **Department of Biomedical Engineering**

6 INSTRUCTOR: _____ DATE: _____

7 COURSE / TOPIC: _____

8 EVALUATOR: _____

9 **5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Good, 3 = Average, 2 = Below Average, 1 = Poor**

10 1. Preparation for lecture

11 Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

12 Comments:
13
14
15
16
17

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

19 Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

20 Comments:
21
22
23
24
25

26 3. Interest, Enthusiasm, Rapport with the Students

27 Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

28 Comments:
29
30
31
32
33

34 4. Organization of the lecture material

35 Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

36 Comments:
37
38
39
40
41

42 5. Audiovisual, learning materials, handouts

43 Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

44 Comments:
45
46
47
48
49

50 6. Observations of Students reactions and interest

51 Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

52 Comments:

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

7. Responsive to student feedback

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

8. Pace and level of the lecture

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

9. Answering questions

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

10. Use of Examples

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

11. Overall quality of the lecture

Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Overall Comments:

1 **Appendix B: Timeline Guide:**

2
3 Specific Timeline Guide (**to be used as a guideline to help meet specific deadlines**).

4
5 *This is a guideline so there is leeway with the listed dates – except for the dates that affect when materials*
6 *are delivered to the College. If falling on a weekend, due dates should generally be adjusted to the*
7 *preceding Friday.*

8 **Tenure cases:**

9 By January 15

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

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

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

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

14
15 Due 5/15 (from candidates)

16 1 page biography*

17 3 page summary of scholarship, teaching, service accomplishments and plans*

18 CV*

19 3-5 peer-reviewed, archival papers*

20 *To be sent to external evaluators

21 Names of 5 potential evaluators

22 Updated Dossier, V1

23
24 By 6/1:

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

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

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

30
31 By 6/15:

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

34 AP&T Chair will call and/or e-mail all 8 evaluators asking if they will provide evaluation by 8/15

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

36
37 By 7/1:

38 Letter soliciting an evaluation of the candidate is mailed to the 8 evaluators. Letter is signed by
39 Department Chair and AP&T Committee Chair and sent with the 1 page biography, 3-page
40 summary, 3-5 papers, and CV. Due date back from evaluators is 8/15.

41
42 By 8/10:

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

44 8/16:

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

46
47 8/20:

48 Final dossier due from the candidate

49
50 Initial meeting of AP&T committee with Department Chair

51 5 meeting times will be scheduled for AP&T meetings

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

- 1 Duties assigned to subcommittees, members appointed:
2 Scholarship (including verification of citations)
3 Teaching (including SEI, peer review, etc.)
4 Service
5
6 Committee meetings 1,2, 3 (draft letter)
7
8 10/1: (Committee meeting 4)
9 Committee vote and letter finalized
10 Committee contributions to packet due (including citation verification, SEI, etc.)
11 Forms signed by committee members
12
13 10/7: Committee letter complete and signed
14
15 10/15: Department Chair letter complete and signed
16 Committee letter and Department Chair letter available to candidate
17
18 10/25: Candidate response, if any, due
19 Final committee meeting (5)
20
21 11/1: Final packet ready for submission to the Dean's office
22
-

23
24 **4th Year Review cases:**

25 By 11/10

- 26 AP&T Chair reviews prior documentation of teaching performance, checking for completeness
27 AP&T Chair reviews file, checking to make sure all past annual reviews are available
28

29 Due 12/1 (from candidates)

- 30 1 page biography
31 3 page summary of scholarship, teaching, service accomplishments and plans
32 4-year record of scholarship activity (form to be supplied)
33 SEI from most recent year's courses
34 CV
35 3-5 peer-reviewed, archival papers
36 Updated Dossier, V1
37

38 1/15:

39 Final dossier due from the candidate
40

41 Initial meeting of AP&T committee with Department Chair

42 4 meeting times will be scheduled for AP&T meetings

43 Duties assigned to subcommittees, members appointed:

44 Scholarship (including verification of citations)

45 Teaching (including SEI, peer review, etc.)

46 Assigns two committee members to review classroom visits and assessments

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

48 Service
49

50 Committee meetings 1,2 (draft letter)
51

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

Approved by BME Faculty on March 27, 2015

1 2/9: (Committee meeting 3)
2 Committee vote and letter finalized
3 Committee contributions to packet due (including citation verification, SEI, etc.)
4 Forms signed by committee members
5

6 2/12: Committee letter complete and signed
7

8 2/16: Department Chair letter complete and signed
9 Committee letter and Department Chair letter available to candidate
10

11 2/26: Candidate response, if any, due
12 Final committee meeting (4)
13

14 2/28: Final packet ready for submission to Dean's Office
15

16 **Annual Review: probationary and tenured faculty members:**

17 The following is for a "standard" annual review. Tenured faculty may also periodically request an
18 evaluation by the full professors on the AP&T committee (e.g., prior to promotion, or for seeking a
19 broader perspective on achievements) similar to that for probationary faculty members.
20

21 Due 4/5 (from faculty member): Annual Review Materials Part 1

22 1 page biography
23 3 page summary of research, teaching, service accomplishments and plans
24 4-year record of research activity (form to be supplied)
25 Updated Dossier
26 Citation record for calendar year
27 Response to previous year's specific goals
28 Plans for research and service
29

30 Due 5/10 (from faculty member): Annual Review Materials Part 2

31 SEI from year's courses
32 Self evaluation in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service
33 Plans
34

35 By 6/1: faculty member one-on-one meeting with Department Chair
36

37 By 7/15: Chair letter to faculty member, copied to Dean
38
39