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INTRODUCTION

This document provides a brief description of the Department of Pathology as well as a description of its policies and procedures. It supplements the Rules of the University Faculty and other policies and procedures of the University to which the department and its faculty are subject. Although the Department of Pathology is subject to the rules and governance of the College of Medicine and The Ohio State University, the Department has the ability to provide its own set of rules and patterns of administration that are specific to the academic discipline of pathology provided these rules and patterns of administration are not in conflict with the rules of the College of Medicine and The Ohio State University.

DEPARTMENT MISSION

The term University means one truth or a search for truth. All faculty members of the Department of Pathology, irrespective of rank or series, must utilize their respective strengths to be engaged in this mission. The search for truth involves the discovery or creation of new knowledge (research), the promulgation or dissemination of knowledge (teaching), and the application of knowledge (service).

The Department's central commitment is to the diverse and evolving discipline of pathology. It is a discipline that promotes the health of all humankind and improves care of the ill, and furthers the understanding, knowledge, diagnosis and treatment of disease. This mission is accomplished through the teaching of students of all levels, conducting clinical, translational and basic research, and providing service to patients, the university and the greater community. The department seeks to accomplish its mission in an outstanding fashion and to be recognized locally, nationally, and internationally for this excellence. Central tenets of this mission are mutual respect and citizenship by its faculty and staff, and the concept that excellence denotes exemplary achievements and continuous improvement of quality.

ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT SERVICES AND STAFF

The Department of Pathology Administrative suite is located in 129 Hamilton Hall. The suite contains the offices of the Chair, Chief Administrative Officer, Human Resources Administrator and related administrative support. With the increasing focus on translational research occurring in the later half of this decade, additional administrative personnel will be hired to support the translational mission.
Updated Organization Chart to be inserted
OVERVIEW OF DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION AND DECISION-MAKING

Policy and program decisions are made in a number of ways: by the department faculty as a whole, by standing or special committees of the department, by the chair, and by shared governance with input from all of the aforementioned components. The nature and importance of any individual matter determines how it is addressed. Department and governance proceeds on the general principle that the more important and widespread the matter to be decided, the more widespread the agreement on a decision needs to be. Open discussions, both formal and informal, constitute the primary means of reaching consensus on decisions of central and widespread importance.

DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION

I. Responsibilities and Role of Chair: The chair is the administrative head of the department and represents the faculty of the department in dealing with the Dean or others in the University administration as stated in the University Administrative Code #3335-3-35. The duties of the chair are as follows:

A. To have general administrative responsibility for the department’s program, subject to the approval of the dean of the college.
B. To operate the department business efficiently.
C. To evaluate continuously the activities and lead in the study of methods improving them.
D. To develop with consultation from the faculty a pattern of administration.
   1) The chair will provide a schedule of all regular faculty meetings to all faculty members on a calendar year basis.
   2) The chair will maintain minutes of all faculty meetings and maintain records of all actions covered by the pattern of administration.
   3) The chair will consult with the faculty as a whole on all policy matters, and such consideration will, whenever practical, be undertaken at a meeting of the faculty as a whole.
   4) The chair will recognize in principle the presumption favoring majority faculty rule on all matters covered by the Pattern of Administration. Whenever majority rule is not followed, the chair shall explain the reasons for the departure to enhance communication and to facilitate understanding within the department. Where possible, this statement of reasons shall be provided before the departure occurs. This explanation shall outline the decision of the majority of the faculty, the decision of the chair, and the reasons the decisions differ. The explanation shall be communicated to the faculty in writing, where possible, or at a faculty meeting with an opportunity provided for faculty to comment. In all matters affecting the faculty, genuine efforts at reaching a consensus will be implemented.
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5) The faculty shall be consulted in the initiation and in the review and selection of new faculty members for appointment.

6) The Chair will develop a policy (see Faculty Workload Guidelines) that explains faculty duties and responsibilities in instruction, scholarship, and service. Duties are to be assigned and distributed equitably.

E. To prepare, after consultation with the faculty, a statement setting forth the criteria and procedures concerning appointments and/or dismissals, salary adjustment, promotions in rank and matters affecting the tenure of the faculty. This statement shall be made available to all present and prospective faculty members of the department, and a copy shall be deposited in the Office of the Dean of the college and in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. At the beginning of each four-year term of the Chair, the members of the department, the Office of the Dean of the college, and the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost shall receive either a revision or reaffirmation of the original statement.

F. To plan with the members of the faculty and the dean of the college a progressive program.

G. To evaluate faculty members annually in accordance with the criteria approved by the board of trustees and subject to instructions from the senior vice president and provost, and also according to the supplemental criteria set up by the department.

H. To inform faculty members when they receive their annual review of their right to review their primary personnel file maintained by their tenure initiating unit and to place in that file a response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file.

I. To recommend to the dean of the college, after consultation with the faculty, appointments, promotions, dismissals, and matters affecting the tenure of members of the department.

J. To encourage research and educational investigations.

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

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

M. To prepare (after consultation with the professors, associate professors, and assistant professors with tenure) annual budget recommendations for the consideration of the dean of the college.

N. To promote improvement of instruction by providing for the evaluation of each course when offered, including written evaluation by students of the course and instructors, and periodic review course review of the faculty.

O. The Chair is accountable for all clinical, professional and administrative activities within the department. As such, and according to University Hospital Medical Bylaws, the Chair serves as the Chief of Pathology Services.
II. Responsibilities and Role of Vice-Chairs: The Vice-Chairs provide regional leadership and have responsibility for the specific departmental branches, i.e. anatomic, clinical, experimental, education, etc. The Vice-Chairs are at will appointments by the Chair. Decisions regarding appointments of clinical branch directors are done in consultation with the Medical Director of the OSU Medical Center. The duties include:

A. To assist the Chair in meeting his/her duties as outlined above (I A-O).
B. Responsibility for the administrative and technical branch activities.
C. Operate the branch efficiently and effectively.
D. Evaluate and investigate methods to continuously improve the branch activities.
E. Investigate, plan, and implement methods that contribute to the mission of the department and medical center.
F. Share responsibility for the educational programs that transcend each branch.
G. Align the operations with those of the department and medical center.

III. Committees: The Department of Pathology has five standing committees, as outlined below. The Chair, in consultation with the branch directors and also through self-nomination by faculty, appoints members to all committees. Committee appointments are for one year and serve in an advisory capacity to the Chair. Exception to the two previous statements is the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Advisory Committee. Members of this committee are elected by the faculty and serve for multiple years.

A. Vice Chairs Committee - The Committee meets on the fourth Wednesday of every month and consists of the Chair and Vice-Chairs. The members consider issues specific to their individual branches as well as departmental issues at large.

B. Appointment, Promotion & Tenure (APT) Advisory Committee – The APT Advisory Committee is elected by the faculty to conduct the promotion and tenure process and to make recommendations to the Chair on faculty appointment, promotion and tenure activities.

C. Quality Management Committee – This committee is charged with quality assurance review, monitoring of departmental quality control measures, maintaining compliance with CLIA (CAP) standards for all anatomical and clinical testing.

D. Residency Advisory Committee – This committee reviews, revises and has oversight over the residency program and advises the Residency Program Director and Chair on any changes to the program.

E. OSUP Committee – This Committee consists of elected faculty representatives as well as the Chief Administrative Officer and legal counsel to address issues effecting the practice plan, the LLC and providing input with regards to faculty contracts, bonuses, termination notice and other matters. The Committee meets on a quarterly basis and also deals with issues effecting OSUP at large.

(See next page for committee membership.)
Department of Pathology
2006-2007 Committee Assignments

Vice Chairs Committee
Amy Gewirtz, MD
Charles Hitchcock, MD, PhD
Stephen Qualman, MD, PhD
Saul Suster, MD
Allan Yates, MD, PhD

Appointment, Promotion & Tenure (APT) Advisory Committee
Wendy Frankel, MD
Amy Gewirtz, MD
Nyla Heerema, PhD
William Marsh, Jr., MD
Tibor Nadasdy, MD
Stephen Qualman, MD, PhD
Allan Yates, MD, PhD (chair)

Quality Management Committee
Karen Billingslea
Michael Bissell, MD, PhD (chair)
Anthon Brooks
Sharon Cook
Amy Gewirtz, MD
Charles Hitchcock, MD, PhD
Melanie Kennedy, MD
Joel Lucas, MD
Kevin Shively, MT(ASCP)
Saul Suster, MD

Residency Advisory Committee
Sanford Barsky, MD
Wendy Frankel, MD (chair)
Amy Gewirtz, MD
Nyla Heerema, PhD
Charles Hitchcock, MD, PhD
Rafael Jimenez, MD
Melanie Kennedy, MD
Gerard Lozanski, MD
Saul Suster, MD

OSUP Committee
Sanford H. Barsky, MD (chair)
Wendy Frankel, MD
Amy Gewirtz, MD
Rafael Jimenez, MD
Harry Pukay-Martin
William Marsh, Jr., MD
IV. Faculty Meetings: The Department of Pathology faculty meetings are conducted the first Wednesday of each month. The Chair of the Department or his/her designee chairs the meetings. Faculty members may contribute to the agenda by submitting requests to the Chair. The agenda has the following standing reports:

- Chair's Report
- Clinical Pathology
- Anatomic Pathology
- COM Issues:
  - Med Student Education
  - Faculty Council Update
  - Residency Committee
  - Graduate Education and Research
  - Biomedical Informatics
  - Human Tissue Resource Network
  - Children's Hospital Report
  - Financial Report

Minutes and a record of attendance of the faculty meetings are kept in the Department Administrative Suite and a copy of the clinical services report is sent to the OSU Medical Director’s office. Attendance is strongly recommended and it is expected that faculty will attend all faculty meetings. A quorum consists of the faculty members present and a simple majority of those present can approve motions.

FACULTY VOTING RIGHTS

The voting faculty consists of all regular and regular clinical track faculty members who have at least a 50% appointment in the Department. Regular clinical track faculty members may participate fully in departmental administrative procedures and decisions, but may not vote on matters of promotion and tenure, except as defined by university policies. Auxiliary faculty members may not vote, but may be asked to offer opinions regarding specific issues for which they may have meaningful information. Individuals with courtesy appointments (primary appointments in another department with no salary support from the Department of Pathology) may not vote in matters of departmental governance or policy.
### Faculty Productivity Guidelines

**Faculty Approval: September 6, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Research Commitment</th>
<th>Clinical Service Commitment</th>
<th>Teaching Commitment</th>
<th>Extramural Support</th>
<th>Publication Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Tenure, Research Scientist</td>
<td>80-90%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
<td>Required: PI on an extramural grant or major time/effort in a multiple-investigator extramural grant</td>
<td>Required: at least 3 papers/year as first or senior author, at least 1 in a high impact journal (≥4) as first or senior author. Books, chapters, abstracts, and presentations also considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Tenure, Clinician Scientist</td>
<td>25-75%</td>
<td>25-65%</td>
<td>10-30%</td>
<td>Required: participation in at least one extramural grant Encouraged: PI of at least one smaller or intramural grant</td>
<td>Required: at least 3 papers/year as first or senior author. Encouraged: publication of at least 1 paper in a high impact journal (≥4) as well as collaborative publications. Books, chapters, abstracts, presentations also considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Clinical</td>
<td>10-25%</td>
<td>50-85%</td>
<td>10-25%</td>
<td>Encouraged: release time as Co-PI, Co-I or collaborator on extramural grants; release time will allow service reduction</td>
<td>Required: 2 papers/year in collaborative studies. Encouraged: first or senior authorship. Books, chapters, abstracts, presentations also considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Research</td>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td>Required: PI on an extramural grant or major time/effort role in a multiple-investigator extramural grant</td>
<td>Required: at least 3 papers/year as first or senior author, at least 1 in a high impact journal (≥4) as first or senior author. Books, chapters, abstracts, and presentations also considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>0-10%</td>
<td>85-100%</td>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>Strongly encouraged: minor role as collaborator or equivalent in extramural funded effort</td>
<td>Required: 1 paper/year. Books, chapters, abstracts, and presentations also considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all these series, some time credit is given for administrative commitments, which can vary according to workload assignments. A proportional decrease in other commitments would be anticipated. Non-clinical service administrative efforts should be approved by the Chair. Additional credit will be awarded to faculty with a large teaching and administrative-teaching commitment.

Earning tenure does not reduce the requirement for scholastic achievement or productivity. These guidelines are meant to be flexible but provide optimization for the scholastic performance of all faculty members, irrespective of series or rank. As The Ohio State University pursues its projected goal of being in the top quartile of American medical colleges, these
productivity guidelines may be revised in tandem with University benchmarks of academic excellence. Changes to the guidelines will be gradual and require approval by the faculty members of the Department of Pathology.

What is also important is the trajectory of the faculty member; academic progress is defined as progressive increases in these productivity guidelines. The Chair is committed to helping all faculty members achieve these goals.

Recruitment of new faculty members may be based on rising expectations of academic performance. Therefore, academic expectations negotiated between the Chair and the candidate, per written letter of offer, supersede these faculty productivity guidelines.
POLICY ON PAID EXTERNAL CONSULTING, PROFESSIONAL LEAVE, AND VACATION
Faculty Approval:

The Department of Pathology recognizes that there must be a balance between a faculty member's presence at the Medical Center, a faculty member’s need to serve as an “Ambassador of OSU” at national meetings, conferences, etc., a faculty member's desire to provide expert consultation (professional, research, or medical-legal), and a faculty member's need for personal time with self, family and friends. To achieve this balance, the faculty have adopted this policy.

Absences from the Medical Center related to University Business (meetings, conferences, study sections, CME credit courses, etc.) will be limited to 20 days per year.

Absences from the Medical Center related to paid external consulting will be limited to 12 days per year.

Absences from the Medical Center related to vacation and/or sick leave will be limited to the days accrued and candidate eligibility access to the College of Medicine and University rules of vacation and/or sick leave.

Leaves of any sort must be approved by the relevant Vice-Chair and in the case of the Vice-Chairs, approved by the Chair.

It should be formally acknowledged that service or teaching operational requirements take priority over any other individual commitments.

The “application for leave” form must be completed by all faculty members (including auxiliary faculty) and must be turned in for approval to the appropriate Vice-Chair or Chair in a timely fashion (at least two weeks prior to leave date).

Policy on Paid External Consulting

All consulting must have prior approval of the Chair. If consulting uses departmental and University resources, any remuneration earned must be disclosed and shared.

If consulting does not use departmental or University resources, remuneration can be privately earned. Paid external consulting must occur during non-work hours, on weekends, or on vacation, or within the 12-day limit of external consulting. External consulting must not represent a conflict of interest and must not interfere with expected departmental duties, assignments, and performance. All paid external consulting must have prior approval of the chair.
Policy on Vacation/Sick Leave

Vacation time for all faculty members (including auxiliary faculty) should be the same as current University Policy. See the Benefits Overview Booklet.

- 100% FTE: 22 days per year (less than 25 years of service) with carryover. Twenty-five days per year for 25+ years of service.
- Less than 100% FTE: time may be pro-rated.
- Less than 50% FTE: no time is accumulated.

Sick leave for all members (including auxiliary faculty) should be the same as the current University policy. See the Benefits Overview Booklet.

- 100% FTE: accrue at 10 hours/month.
- Less than 100% FTE: accrue at a pro-rated amount according to time worked.

Additional leave policies can be found in the University Handbook and on the following web pages:

A. Entrepreneurial Leave of Absence (NEW)
   http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/ix_loaentrepren.html
B. Unpaid Leave of Absence (LOA)
   http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/ix_loa.html
C. Faculty Professional Leave (FPL)
   http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/ix_fpl.html
D. Special Research Assignment (SRA)
   http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/ix_sra.html
FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW POLICY

The Pathology Department Chair or his/her designee as stated by Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, conducts annual reviews of all faculty. During this process the faculty member's academic performance will be reviewed with respect to four documents: 1) Pathology Faculty Workload Guidelines; 2) Pathology Patterns of Administration; 3) Pathology Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Document; and 4) previous annual review documents with stated goals and benchmarks.

Each of these documents sets forth expectations both for contributions of faculty members to the Department of Pathology and individual scholarly accomplishments. However, each document emphasizes a different aspect of the complex pattern of activities in which pathology faculty members are involved. It is recognized that pathology faculty members consist of a heterogeneous group of individuals with different abilities and appointments who make different contributions to the multifaceted mission of the department. It is the responsibility of the Chair and his/her representatives to distribute the workload among the faculty in a fashion that will both optimize the department's performance and allow the faculty members to progress academically. The workload assignments must be consistent with the expectations set forth in the Pathology Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Document, the Pathology Faculty Workload Guidelines, Pathology Patterns of Administration, and previous annual reviews. The Chair's determination of a faculty member's salary and work assignments will be based on an assessment of all three of the following: 1) scholarly achievements; 2) overall contributions to the departmental mission; and 3) citizenship. These are all in relation to other faculty member's contributions in the department as well as the departmental benchmarks and its vision. The policy and criteria for the annual reviews are contained in the Pathology Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Document and Pathology Patterns of Administration, which can be accessed on the I-drive under Common/Admin/Patterns of Administration/Patterns of Administration2007.

The Department of Pathology follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook:

- Tenure Track: [http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/x_annreview.html](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/x_annreview.html)
- Clinical Track: [http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/x_annreviewrct.html](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/x_annreviewrct.html)
- Research Track: [http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/x_annreviewrtr.html](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/x_annreviewrtr.html)

The Chair of Pathology is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.
PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK FACULTY
The Chair of Pathology, or his/her designate, will inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place. The faculty member will provide the Chair, or his/her designate, with a listing that outlines the accomplishments of the faculty member since the last review.

Appropriate Chair designates include the faculty member and his/her branch. Before review, the listing must be complete, and should contain verified documentation of accomplishments. Detailed guidelines for the listing should be available to all faculty members on request. External evaluations of the faculty member's work may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by any of the individual's involved in the annual review process.

The annual review file should provide information in multiple categories. Examples include:
- Quantitative assessment of time allocation to the various academic endeavors, such as a time audit;
- Quantitative assessment of clinical activity
- Detailed list of research accomplishments, including publications, active research grants, abstracts for professional meetings, invited lectureships, invention disclosures and/or patent filings;
- Documentation of teaching, including lists of lectures and/or other forms of student mentoring, and student evaluations of teaching ability;
- Documentation of administrative responsibilities, including departmental, hospital and college committees, local and national professional organizations, and visiting professorships;
- Documentation of continuing education, such as attendance at national conferences;
- Miscellaneous information related to citizenship.

In addition to this specific information, a current and complete copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae should be provided.

The file will be reviewed by the Chair of Pathology or his/her designate. It will be evaluated to determine if the faculty member has met or exceeded the minimal standards of academic performance for the department as outlined in the Pathology Faculty Workload Guidelines, Pathology Patterns of Administration, Pathology Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Document, and previous annual reviews. The Chair, or his/her designate, will provide a written appraisal of the faculty member's performance that directly addresses the quality and amount of achievement in each of the categories of information in the file. This evaluation will define strengths and weaknesses of a faculty member's performance, and it will provide recommendations for the ensuing year. Progress toward recommendations from the previous year should be discussed. A final statement should provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance, and describe the faculty member's suitability for his/her chosen
academic track and potential for future promotion/tenure, if applicable. If the review is not prepared by the Chair, the Chair will edit and/or endorse this review and meet formally with the faculty member to discuss the review if requested by the faculty member. At the completion of the review, the Chair will provide the faculty member and the Dean of the College with a copy of his/her written evaluation of performance and professional development, and an indication of whether the faculty member will be reappointed for an additional year. If the Chair’s recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. A recommendation from the chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows 4th Year Review Procedures (see faculty rule 3335-6-03) and the Dean of the College makes the final decision in the matter.

All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member’s dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. The faculty member may respond in writing to issues raised during the annual review. All review letters and written faculty responses shall become a permanent part of the faculty member’s dossier, and will be considered during subsequent annual reviews, including the review for promotion and tenure.

Probationary appointments may be terminated for inadequate performance or professional development. When non-renewal is based on the faculty member’s performance or professional development, it must be conducted as described in faculty rule 3335-6-03(G). Probationary appointments may also be terminated for fiscal or programmatic reasons. When non-renewal is based on fiscal or programmatic reasons, e.g., complete elimination or restructuring of programs, instructors and or resources within the University (faculty rule 3335-6-06 and as described in rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code) the faculty member should be notified in advance and in writing that non-renewal has been established. Non-renewal of a probationary appointment for fiscal or programmatic reasons does not entail a performance review, and requires the prior approval of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Executive Vice President and Provost. Because hiring decisions should be based on informed assumptions regarding the future availability of resources and programmatic needs, approval of such non-renewals will be based on the extent to which convincing evidence is provided that the fiscal or programmatic reasons for non-renewal are long-lasting and could not be anticipated when the appointment was made.

Decisions affecting the non-renewal of a probationary appointment may not be arbitrary or capricious or carried out in violation of the faculty member’s right to academic freedom. Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 of the Administrative Code provides a procedural mechanism under which an aggrieved probationary faculty member can challenge a non-renewal decision believed to be improper. In that instance, however, the burden of proof is on the probationary faculty member to establish that the non-renewal decision was improper (see also Faculty Rule 3335-6-05).
Fourth Year Review. During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the Dean of the College of Medicine (not the Chair of the Department of Pathology) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. However, at the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the College of Medicine for review, regardless of whether the Chair of Pathology recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. The full text of the rule is available at http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html.

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

A year may be excluded from the probationary period for the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six. The request to exclude time for this reason must be made within one year of the birth or adoption and before the start of the mandatory tenure review year. Requests to exclude time for childbirth or adoption are approved and forwarded to the dean and Office of Academic Affairs, unless approval is barred by provisions of the Faculty Rule.

A faculty member may also apply for an exclusion of time due to adverse events that were beyond the faculty member's control and impeded productivity. These requests are reviewed by the APT Advisory Committee, which advises the Chair of Pathology on the matter. Approval is based on the nature of the adverse event, the extent to which it was beyond the faculty member's control, and the faculty member's productivity before and after the period of the event. The department chair, dean, and Office of Academic Affairs must approve the request before it may be implemented. A negative recommendation by any of these parties terminates the review process.

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

Tenured Faculty
A written annual review of all tenure track faculty members is required. The purpose of the annual review for tenure track faculty is to assist in developing and implementing professional plans, discussing accomplishments, identifying performance problems
should they exist, evaluating progress toward promotion, and serving as a basis for annual salary recommendations.

**Clinical Track Faculty**
The purpose of the annual review for all clinical track faculty is to assist in developing and implementing professional plans, discussing accomplishments, identifying performance problems if they exist, evaluating progress toward promotion, and serving as a basis for annual salary recommendations.

Faculty Rule 3335-7-08 sets forth conditions for appointment and reappointment for the clinical faculty. Included in these conditions is a mandatory review in the fourth year of each five-year appointment.

During the fourth year of each five-year appointment, the faculty member will prepare and submit a dossier documenting clinical, teaching, and scholarly activities. The dossier will follow the format required by The Ohio State University for promotion/tenure of regular tenure track faculty, except that outside letters of evaluation are not required. The dossier will be reviewed by the elected Pathology APT Advisory Committee, and submitted to the Chair of the Department for consideration. A recommendation to reappoint the faculty member may be made by the Chair of the Department.

If the Chair makes a negative recommendation, then the reappointment will be formally evaluated by the entire eligible Pathology Promotion and Tenure Committee. The recommendation of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and of the Chair of the Department will be forwarded to the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Medicine & Public Health together with the completed dossier.

In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, the Chair of Pathology must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 [http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-07-08.html](http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-07-08.html) must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review follows the review procedures for promotion of clinical track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

**Research Track Faculty**
The annual review process for research track probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, except that nonprobationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank.
In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the Chair of Pathology must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-07-08.html must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review follows the review procedures for promotion of research track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

DOCUMENTATION
Annual reviews will be conducted in the spring and will specifically review the activity and accomplishments of the immediately prior calendar year. The following format applies to faculty within the tenure, research, and clinical tracks and auxiliary faculty (specifically those auxiliary appointments primary within the Department and accompanied by salary support from the Department), with the exception of those involved in formal promotion reviews and dossier preparation. Faculty members are expected to provide updated curriculum vitae along with information from the following form:

Summary of Research Teaching, Clinical Service Administration, and Departmental/University Service Activities

1. Teaching efforts:
   A. Number of hours directly involved in student contact including description of the effort, i.e., classroom instruction, dissertation committee, etc.
   B. Teaching evaluations
   C. New courses developed

2. Publications from three prior calendar years.

3. Grants awarded in three prior calendar years.

4. Abstracts presented (indicate platform or poster) in three prior calendar years.

5. Invited presentations in the prior calendar year.

6. Inventions disclosed and/or patents filed.

7. Service efforts:
   A. Clinical service, including administration
   B. Committee assignments, including department, university, local, and national organizations.
MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

Merit salary increases will be based upon performance of the faculty member in relation to his or her specific appointment track, Promotion and Tenure Document, Faculty Workload Guideline, and the expectations outlined in the faculty member's previous annual review by the Chair. The principal basis for salary increase will be the performance in the previous year. A lesser influence shall be the aggregate performance over several prior years. For example, a faculty member whose performance was outstanding for several consecutive years but who had an entirely average performance for the immediate previous year might still be considered for a modest increase. A final factor in the level of merit increase can be the faculty member's salary in relation to the average salary for comparable Department members.

Salary increments shall be awarded at five different levels: A, B, C, D, and E. Different specific standards apply to each of the faculty series as enumerated in the Promotion and Tenure document but the overall evaluation and letter grade is based on the relative level of accomplishments that a given faculty member has achieved in the past academic year.

A - represents Outstanding Performance. The faculty member shall have demonstrated exemplary performance to receive an "A" level increase. This performance could represent multiple high quality publications in the most prestigious journals, new funding from external agencies such as the NIH, and national awards or local awards for teaching, research, or service. It could also include meritorious service accomplishments, which includes outstanding quantity and quality of service within the Department or outstanding teaching.

B - represents Above Average Performance. The faculty member shall have exceeded the expectation outlined in the Faculty Workload Guidelines and in the Annual Review Recommendations. This performance may be characterized by multiple publications, teaching awards, achievement of outside funding or other meritorious service accomplishments.

C - represents Average Performance. The faculty member will have met the expectations for teaching, research, publications and clinical activity defined in the Faculty Workload Guidelines and in the Annual Review recommendations.

D - represents Below Average Performance. The faculty member will have less than expected levels of publications, funding for research and clinical activities, a below average teaching record, suboptimal service activities, and/or suboptimal citizenship.

E - represents Unsatisfactory Performance. In this category the faculty member will have no measurable or documented accomplishments. This would mean no
publications or minimal publications, no research grants, less than satisfactory teaching evaluations and/or minimal clinical activities, and/or unsatisfactory citizenship.

In the assessment of salary levels, it is likely that a faculty member's performance will not be at the same level in teaching, research and service. The final evaluation level shall represent a balance of the accomplishments in each of the three areas as appropriate for the specific faculty track, i.e., and regular faculty versus regular clinical faculty.

For individuals in the regular clinical faculty track, evidence of scholarship are primarily centered in the clinical service and teaching areas but still with a minor requirement of translational research or equivalent activities.

For individuals in the regular tenure track, clinician-scientist pathway, there is a proportional greater emphasis on translational research activities, scholarly and academic activities. Teaching and clinical service activities are still important.

For individuals in the regular tenure track, research-scientist pathway, there is a large emphasis on basic and translational research as evidenced by extramural support and high quality publications. Teaching is also viewed as very important.
Release Time/Salary Policy
Faculty Approval:

For all faculty members, release time salary should pay for the proportionate amount of time that a faculty member spends in research projects both as principal investigator as well as co-investigator and/or consultant.

In these times of reduced NIH funding, it is not realistic to expect a faculty member engaged in research (research-scientist pathway or research track) to derive more than 50% of their salary from research grants. However, the 50% figure for research-scientist pathway faculty is expected. For clinician-scientist pathway faculty, a 25-50% salary release time effort should be attained. For regular clinical faculty a 10-25% release time goal should be attained.

For translational research to be successful, collaborative activities must be enhanced. It is expected that percent effort on collaborative grants (irrespective of the role on the grant) must result in the appropriate percent allotment and percent expenditure. That is to say if a faculty member is listed at 10% as a collaborator on a grant, that faculty member and the department must receive a proportional 10% allotment and 10% expenditure.
SPACE POLICY
Faculty Approval:

General Statements
- The following applies only to space specifically allocated to the Department of Pathology for research purposes by The Ohio State University, including the College of Medicine and other members of the University Medical Center.
- The research space assigned to new faculty will be guaranteed for a specific period of time negotiated with the Chair. A recommended time is three years.
- Current faculty with extramural funding including indirect costs will retain research space for a period of 18 months after the end of their funding. This is contingent upon their submission of a proposal for an extramural grant (with indirect costs) within the year prior to this 18-month period. Space for research proposed on grants submitted during this 18 months must be negotiated with and approved by the Chair. As a result of recruitment efforts, research space may be relocated.
- A change in space can be incremental or decremental in parallel with funding.
- Space allocated on the basis of funding will be retained until there is a change in the faculty member's funding status. After a reasonable grace period of up to 18 months, space will be re-evaluated and re-assigned where appropriate.
- This policy provides guidelines for space allocation by the Chair.

Priorities - Research space will be allocated in according with the following priorities (in the order designated):

1. Extramural Funding as Principal Investigator
2. Extramural Funding as a Co-Investigator/Collaborator/Consultant
3. Productivity of the Investigator (peer reviewed publications, abstracts, presentations, awards)
The Department of Pathology has two types of evaluation of faculty teaching: 1) peer review; and 2) student/resident evaluation. The Vice-Chair of the Education Branch is charged with the creation of a practical system to ensure accurate, fair, and complete evaluation of both types.

Guidelines for Peer Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

Introduction
The Department of Pathology has the stated goals of providing the most innovative and appropriate teaching and mentoring to undergraduate, professional and graduate students, residents, fellows, and faculty. Department of Pathology Faculty Workload Guidelines (8/98) state that all faculty, regardless of track (tenure research, scientist, tenure clinical scientist, clinical, or auxiliary) have teaching responsibilities. Both tenure clinical scientist and clinical track requires “visibility in the medical course” and “should have a significant role in resident education.” Tenure research Scientists “can teach graduate or medical students” and “should also teach residents.” Auxiliary faculty “should teach residents” and “assist in medical courses when needed.”

The Need for Evaluation
Peer review of teaching is important for both summative (administrative) and for formative (improvement) purposes. It is an administrative tool for promotion and tenure recommendations. The Ohio State University Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Documentation, dated 4/2000, states that Letters of Evaluation will contain “peer evaluations of teaching.” Folders without peer evaluations will be returned. As a formative tool, peer review is a valuable mechanism for the continuing improvement of faculty educational skills and efforts.

The Evaluation Process
All faculty members with an active role in teaching of undergraduate and graduate students, professional students including medical, dental and/or optometry, and/or residents and fellows will be evaluated. What constitutes teaching?

The Department of Pathology faculty members teach in many different settings. Peer evaluation of teaching can occur in any one of the following settings:
1. Formal Lectures (medical, dental, optometry, graduate, undergraduate course)
2. Small Group Discussions
3. CME
4. AP or CP Teaching Conferences
5. Grand Rounds
6. Sign-out
7. Autopsy
8. Clinical Pathology Rounds
9. CP Didactic Lecture Series
Timeliness of Evaluations
Peer evaluation of teaching will occur at least once per year.

The Evaluators
It is the individual faculty member’s responsibility to select a minimum of one lecture/encounter per year for peer review. The faculty member being evaluated will work with the director of the course/conference/service to select the appropriate evaluator. The evaluator must be a person engaged in the same or similar kinds of educational activities, persons who share content expertise, or persons who bring relevant specialized skills to the task of peer review. For the most part, the course/conference/service director will serve as the primary evaluator.

Utilization of Evaluator
The information from the peer review will be used for both faculty development and evaluation. All peer reviews are meant to be formative and will serve as a feedback designed to contribute to faculty development of teaching. The results of each review will be discussed in person and in writing as part of the department's goal to build upon our current excellence in teaching. Each peer evaluation is also summative. In cases when the course/conference/service director is not the reviewer, the evaluation will be reviewed as part of the decision making for assigning teaching responsibilities. The Department of Pathology Chair will review each evaluation as part of the Annual Review process. Each evaluation will be maintained as part of the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier.

The Review Mechanism
1. The faculty member selects the lecture/encounter to be evaluated.
2. The faculty member meets with the course/conference/service to select the appropriate evaluator.
3. The peer reviewer and the faculty member should meet prior to the evaluation to discuss the evaluation process. It is essential that the reviewer and the faculty member agree in advance about the focus of the review and the evaluation criteria. This discussion should include the faculty member’s teaching goals, any specific things he/she wants feedback on, and a review of any handouts and objectives. It is up to the faculty and peer reviewer to decide where and when the faculty member will be evaluated.
4. The reviewer takes notes and fills out the appropriate evaluation form. Feedback will be description and specific, and not judgemental.
5. Within one week of the observation, the peer reviewer and the faculty member discuss the pros and cons of what was observed with any suggestions for improvement.
6. The reviewer prepares a memorandum summarizing the evaluation. This memorandum and the evaluation form serve as documentation for formative feedback and for the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier.
Department of Pathology  
The Ohio State University  

PEER EVALUATION FOR DIDACTIC TEACHING

Faculty Member's Name: ___________________________  Date: ____________

Reviewer's Name: ___________________________  Sent to Faculty: Yes ___ Date _____ No ___

1 = Strongly Disagree  2 = Disagree  3 = Neutral  4 = Agree  5 = Strongly Agree

Opening:
1. Instructor appeared confident and purposeful
2. Instructor exhibited enthusiasm
3. The opening was short and interesting
4. Instructor presented a clear purpose in terms of the audience's needs

Comments:

Content:
5. The presentation was well organized with clear transitions
6. Instructor appeared knowledgeable about topic
7. Presentation's main points were clear
8. Content level was appropriate for the primary audience
9. Content pace was appropriate for the time available
10. Questions were used appropriately to stimulate audience thinking
11. Examples were illustrative of the main points

Comments:

Body Language Skill:
12. Instructor's gestures, movements, and posture were appropriate
13. Instructor had no distracting mannerisms
14. Instructor made eye contact with all sections of the audience

Comments:

Language Skills:
15. Instructor used complete sentences, correct English, active voice
16. Instructor's voice was clear, varied, and interesting
17. Instructor’s presentation was free of too many "fillers" (e.g. um, er)

Comments:
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**Teaching Materials:**

18. The visuals were appropriate and added value  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
19. The visuals were well designed  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
20. Instructor used an appropriate number of visuals  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
21. Instructor’s handout material complemented the presentation  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
22. Instructor used a laser pointer effectively  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]

Comments:

**Conclusion:**

23. Instructor summarized key points  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
24. Instructor told the audience how they could use the information  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
25. The conclusion left a clear final impression  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]

Comments: _____

**Response to Questions:**

26. Instructor allowed time for questions and answers  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
27. Instructor answered questions succinctly  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
28. Instructor repeated or paraphrased questions  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]
29. Instructor respected questioner and solicited open-ended responses  
   ![Rating 1 2 3 4 5]

Comments:

**Presentation Strengths:**

**Things to Improve:**

---
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Department of Pathology  
The Ohio State University

PEER EVALUATION OF NON-DIDACTIC TEACHING

Faculty Member's Name: ________________________________ Date: ________

Microscope Sign-Out: ______ Gross Pathology: ______ Autopsy: ______ Other: __________________________

Reviewer's Name: ________________________________ Sent to Faculty: Yes _____ Date _____ No _____

Learner Level Observed (check all that apply): PA student ______ medical student ______ resident ______ fellow ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Neutral</th>
<th>4 = Agree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organization:**

1. Oriented trainee to the case 1 2 3 4 5
2. Clarified expectations of the trainee 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

**Engaged trainee:**

1. Encouraged discussion 1 2 3 4 5
2. Demonstrated enthusiasm 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

**Encouraged independent thinking:**

1. Encouraged or stimulated trainee to make decision/defend diagnosis 1 2 3 4 5
2. Asked questions 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

**Feedback:**

1. Provided positive reinforcement and constructive criticism of the trainee 1 2 3 4 5
2. Demonstrated good listening skills 1 2 3 4 5
3. Put trainee in the "warm seat" rather than the "hot seat" 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

**Clinical Ability:**

1. Exhibits good knowledge of the gross/microscopic features of the lesion 1 2 3 4 5
2. Exhibits good clinical knowledge of the case 1 2 3 4 5
3. Serves as a good role model 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

**Professionalism:**

1. Showed respect for the trainee 1 2 3 4 5
2. Demonstrated professional and ethical conduct 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

March 22, 2007

Approved by Office of Academic Affairs: 
September 11, 2007
Overall Teaching quality:  

Strengths: 

Suggestions for Improvement: 

Overall Comments: 

March 22, 2007

Approved by Office of Academic Affairs: September 11, 2007
Guidelines for Student/Resident Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

Introduction
The Department of Pathology has the stated goals of providing the most innovative and appropriate teaching and mentoring to undergraduate, professional, and graduate students, residents, fellows, and faculty. Department of Pathology Faculty Workload Guidelines (8/98) state that all faculty, regardless of track (tenure research, scientist, tenure clinical scientist, clinical, or auxiliary) have teaching responsibilities. Both tenure clinical scientist and clinical tracks require “visibility in the medical course” and “should have a significant role in resident education.” Tenure research scientists “can teach graduate or medical students” and “should also teach residents.” Auxiliary faculty “should teach residents” and “assist in medical courses when needed.”

The College of Medicine guidelines for promotion and tenure require evaluation for each “undergraduate, graduate, and professional course taught since date of hire, or past five years (whichever is more recent).” However, in the past this has not always been possible. This document serves to ensure that the teaching faculty in the Department of Pathology receive full credit for their teaching efforts.

The Need for Evaluation
Student/resident evaluation of faculty teaching is important for both summative (administrative) and formative (improvement) purposes. It is an administrative tool for promotion and tenure recommendations, and for assessment of faculty productivity. As a formative tool, student/resident evaluations are a valuable mechanism for the continuing improvement of faculty educational skills and efforts.

The College of Medicine guidelines for promotion and tenure require extensive documentation of faculty teaching efforts. This document states that the Core Dossier will contain an outline of “undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses taught since date of hire, or past five years (whichever is more recent).” This list must include: 1) a chronological list of courses taught by quarter and year; 2) course number, title, and number of credit hours; 3) final course enrollment; 4) percentage of courses taught based on total student contact hours in the course; 5) brief explanation of your role; 6) indication of whether formal course evaluations were completed by students or others and explain how such evaluations did not occur if you did not check the box. The Core Dossier will also contain “evaluation of teaching since date of hire, or past five years (whichever is more recent).” As part of this, the Core Dossier will: 1) “Describe how the quality of your teaching has been evaluated, i.e. student evaluation of teaching, peer review, departmental surveys;” and 2) “Describe how you have used the evaluation information to improve the quality of instruction;” and 3) “Student Evaluation Data for all courses in which you used some type of fixed response type survey (e.g. the SET, SEI, or comparable form) to obtain student evaluation information, two types of information must be provided...a summary table (and) individual course summaries.”
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Approved by Office of Academic Affairs:
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The Evaluation Process
All faculty members with an active role in teaching of undergraduate and graduate students, professional students including medical, dental, and/or optometry, residents, fellows.

Department of Pathology faculty members teach in many different settings. Peer evaluation of teaching can occur in any one of the following settings:
1. Formal Lectures (e.g., medical, dental, optometry, graduate and undergraduate courses)
2. Small Group Discussions
3. CME Courses and/or Grand Rounds
4. AP or CP Teaching Conferences
5. AP and CP rotations

Timeliness of Evaluations
The College of Medicine guidelines for promotion and tenure require evaluation for each "undergraduate, graduate, and professional course taught since date of hire, or past five years (whichever is more recent)."

Medical student evaluation of faculty lectures in the L/D curriculum and/or participation in the PBL curriculum is part of the ongoing College of Medicine's ongoing program of evaluating faculty teaching. L/D students evaluate the faculty after each division. In general, faculty members are evaluated formally if they gave three or more lectures during a given division. In cases where a faculty member gives less than three lectures, the faculty member must notify the course director and Academic Services that they request an evaluation. Students may also evaluate an individual faculty member as part of formal module evaluations.

Many faculty members in the Department of Pathology are involved in the team teaching efforts for various undergraduate, graduate and professional courses. Current campus course evaluation forms do not reflect the teaching efforts of the individual faculty member's teaching efforts. The Department of Pathology has generated its own departmental form to ensure student evaluations are obtained for each faculty teaching in a course regardless of the number of lectures given. It is up to the discretion of the course director to hand out this form once or twice during the course, preferably at the time of midterm and final exams.

Faculty presentations as part of a formal course that grants CME credit will be formally evaluated by each person enrolled in the course, using the appropriate departmental or non-departmental form.

The residents, using the appropriate departmental form, will evaluate faculty teaching of residents once a year.
The Evaluators
Individuals filling out student evaluation forms will include: 1) Students enrolled in undergraduate, graduate and professional courses taught by members of the Department of Pathology; 2) Those individuals enrolled in a CME course (e.g., weekly Department of Pathology Seminars); and 3) Residents.

Utilization of Evaluations
The information from the student teaching evaluation forms will be used for both faculty development and evaluation. The form will be reviewed by the course director, the Department of Pathology Chair, and the faculty member. Summary statistics for each course will be entered into the department's Faculty Teaching Database and will be used for P&T documentation. This information may be obtained from the Pathology Education office. The faculty member will retain his/her own set of evaluation forms as part of their P&T documentation.

The information on the evaluation forms will be used by the Department of Pathology Chair and the course directors to make faculty teaching assignments. The faculty member may review the student evaluations with the course director and/or the Department of Pathology Chair as needed. In addition, the Department of Pathology Chair will review the evaluations as part of the individual faculty member's annual review process.
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY
RESIDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY TEACHING

Departmental Division:

Name of faculty member being evaluated:

Date of evaluation: ________________________________

Pathology resident/student/rotator (circle one)

Please evaluate each faculty member encountered during the rotation. The evaluations are anonymous and are evaluated once yearly for each faculty member. The purpose of the evaluation is to improve resident teaching and to document excellence in faculty teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability, willingness to spend time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth and accuracy of knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra effort put forth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name (optional): ___________________________________________

Additional comments: _________________________________________

AFTER COMPLETION, PLEASE RETURN TO:
Gretchen Staschiak, Pathology Education Coordinator, Department of Pathology,
The Ohio State University, 129 Hamilton Hall, 1645 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05. This rule requires candidates who believe that they have been improperly evaluated to seek to resolve the matter informally before filing a formal appeal under that rule.

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

Faculty members in the Department of Pathology who wish to appeal a nonrenewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision can do so only after the Provost has rendered a decision and must do so in writing within one month of receipt of notification of the decision. Note that this is separate from the comment process – the comments process provides an opportunity for a faculty member to raise issues while the review is in process. The appeal should be based upon the faculty member's contention that a decision was based upon improper evaluation. The appeal letter must reference the policies and standards in question and provide the faculty member's evidence for disputing the decision by the University.

The appeal letter shall be directed to the committee or person alleged to have acted improperly. The response to the review will be either to acknowledge that some aspect of the review was done improperly by redoing the review, or indicate that the review was initially done properly. In all cases, reconsideration of the merits for promotion and/or tenure only occurs if it is clear that the original review was flawed.
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