

**PATTERNS OF
ADMINISTRATION
/PROMOTION AND
TENURE
DOCUMENT**

**DEPARTMENT OF MOLECULAR
VIROLOGY, IMMUNOLOGY AND
MEDICAL GENETICS**

October 29, 1999

VII.	APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE	24
A.	PREAMBLE.....	24
B.	APPOINTMENTS.....	25
1)	<i>Criteria for Tenure-Track Regular Faculty Appointments.....</i>	<i>25</i>
2)	<i>Criteria for Auxiliary Faculty Appointments.....</i>	<i>26</i>
3)	<i>Criteria for Courtesy and Emeritus Appointments.....</i>	<i>28</i>
4)	<i>Procedures for Appointing Tenure-Track Faculty.....</i>	<i>29</i>
5)	<i>Procedures for Appointing Auxiliary Faculty.....</i>	<i>31</i>
6)	<i>Procedures for Appointing Courtesy and Emeritus Faculty.....</i>	<i>31</i>
C.	ANNUAL REVIEWS	32
1)	<i>University Procedures for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty Members.....</i>	<i>32</i>
2)	<i>Departmental Procedures for Annual Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty.....</i>	<i>35</i>
3)	<i>Department Procedures for Annual Review of Tenured Faculty.....</i>	<i>35</i>
D.	MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	36
1)	<i>Criteria for Merit Salary Increases.....</i>	<i>36</i>
2)	<i>Procedures for Merit Salary Increases.....</i>	<i>38</i>
3)	<i>Documentation for Merit Salary Increases.....</i>	<i>38</i>
E.	REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF MOLECULAR VIROLOGY, IMMUNOLOGY AND MEDICAL GENETICS	38
1)	<i>Criteria: Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure.....</i>	<i>39</i>
2)	<i>Criteria: Promotion to the Rank of Professor.....</i>	<i>42</i>
3)	<i>Procedures.....</i>	<i>44</i>
4)	<i>Documentation Required for Promotion and/or Tenure Reviews.....</i>	<i>46</i>
5)	<i>Evaluation of the Candidate by the Promotions and Tenure Committee.....</i>	<i>48</i>
6)	<i>Report of Recommendation to Chair of Department.....</i>	<i>49</i>
7)	<i>Letter from Chair of Department.....</i>	<i>49</i>
8)	<i>Submission of Dossier to College of Medicine and Public Health.....</i>	<i>50</i>
9)	<i>Termination of Review Process.....</i>	<i>50</i>
10)	<i>Timetable for Annual, Promotion and/or Tenure Reviews.....</i>	<i>50</i>
11)	<i>Summary of Documentation Materials to be Examined in Promotion and.....</i>	<i>51</i>
12)	<i>Reconsideration of Cases by Review Bodies.....</i>	<i>52</i>
F.	APPEALS OF DECISIONS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION.....	53
1)	<i>Appeals.....</i>	<i>53</i>
G.	SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	53
	APPENDIX.....	55

VII. APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE

A. PREAMBLE

This section of the Patterns of Departmental Administration is a supplement to Chapter 47 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the College and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the Department shall follow those new rules and polices until such time as it can update this section of the document to reflect the changes. It reaffirms the Department's mission, and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, it sets forth its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and other rewards including salary increases. In approving this section of the document, the Dean and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in the following Faculty Rule: Rule 3335-47-01 General considerations.

Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure (except when the provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-47-03[H] are invoked). Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance--normally tenure-initiating unit colleagues. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes, to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, or promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reasons that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence.

In accordance with a policy of equality of opportunity, decisions concerning appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure shall be free of discrimination as to race, creed, religion, national origin, age, sex, disability, Vietnam-era veteran status, or sexual orientation.

B. APPOINTMENTS

1) Criteria for Tenure-Track Regular Faculty Appointments

Regular faculty are defined as: “persons with the titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor who serve on appointments totaling fifty per cent or more service to the university. Regular faculty are tenure-track faculty.” [Rule 3335-5-19(A)]. According to Faculty Rule 3335-47-02(A): The Ohio State University has as its stated mission "the attainment of international distinction in education, scholarship, and public service.” Appointment decisions for regular faculty positions must be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Appointments at the rank of Instructor should normally only be made when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment.

a) Assistant Professor Appointments

According to Faculty Rule 3335-47-03(B)(1): “An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An Assistant Professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an Assistant Professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.”

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, the appointee at the Assistant Professor level normally will have had a strong post-doctoral experience. Appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor will be reviewed by the departmental Promotions and Tenure Committee with recommendation provided to the Chair. Exclusion of time from probationary periods within the Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology will be in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-47-03(D)(1)-(6). In addition, service credit for appointees, extension of probationary period and termination of probationary appointments will be in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-47-03 (E)(F)(G)(H) and (I).

b) Associate Professor and Professor Appointments

According to Faculty Rule 3335-47-03(B)(1): “an appointment as Professor or Associate Professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the tenure-initiating unit and College. For

the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor require prior approval of the Provost.”

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, the length of probationary service for Associate Professors or higher will be reviewed by the departmental Promotions and Tenure Committee with recommendation provided to the Chair.

c) Instructor Appointments

“An appointment to the rank of Instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An Instructor must be approved for promotion to Assistant Professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an Instructor is promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor, prior service credit will be granted for time spent as an Instructor unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of the promotion that he or she does not wish such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs through the Dean of the College so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.” [Rule 3335-47-03(B)(1)].

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, appointments will not normally be made at the instructor level. Exclusion of time from probationary periods within the Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology will be in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-47-03(D)(1)-(6). In addition, service credit for appointees, extension of probationary period and termination of probationary appointments will be in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-47-03(E)(F)(G)(H) and (I).

2) Criteria for Auxiliary Faculty Appointments

Auxiliary faculty as defined in Faculty Rule 3335-5-19(C) are “persons with adjunct titles, clinical titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles; also Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors who serve on appointments with less than 50% service to the University. Persons with regular tenure-track faculty titles may not hold auxiliary titles. Persons holding auxiliary titles are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.”

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, auxiliary appointments are recommended at the discretion of the Department Chair

after consultation with the faculty and are made for periods not to exceed one year, and entail no commitment to renew the appointment beyond that period. In order to confer auxiliary faculty status, individuals must possess credentials comparable to regular faculty of equivalent rank. Regular faculty criteria will serve as a basis for evaluating the occasional auxiliary faculty member who desires promotion. Procedures for promotion and annual review shall be the same as for the promotion of regular faculty. An appointment at no-salary is warranted only if there is substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department.

a) “The titles of Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, and Adjunct Instructor shall be used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to regular faculty of equivalent rank, who provide significant uncompensated service to the instructional and/or research programs of the University and who require a faculty title to perform that service. Significant service would include teaching the equivalent of one or more courses, advising graduate students or serving on graduate committees, and serving as a co-investigator on a research project. Such individuals may be either nonuniversity employees or University employees compensated on a noninstructional budget. Adjunct appointments are made for the period in which the uncompensated service is provided not to exceed one year; renewal is contingent upon continued significant contributions. Procedures for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as for promotion of regular faculty.” [Rule 3335-5-19(C)(1)].

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, adjunct appointments are at the discretion of the Department Chair after consultation with the faculty.

b) “The titles of Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, and Visiting Instructor shall be used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to regular faculty of equivalent rank who spend a limited period of time on formal appointment while in residence at this institution for the purpose of participating in the instructional and research programs of the University. A visiting appointment cannot exceed three continuous academic years of service.” [Rule 3335-5-19 (C)(3)].

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, visiting appointments are at the discretion of the Department Chair after consultation with the faculty, can be made for only one year at a time, and require formal annual review if they are to be continued.

c) “The titles of lecturer and senior lecturer shall be used for all compensated instructional appointments where other titles are not appropriate.

Lecturers' responsibilities shall be limited to formal course instruction.”
[Rule 3335-5-19(C)(4)].

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, appointments of lecturers and source(s) for compensation will be at the discretion of the Department Chair after consultation with the faculty.

3) **Criteria for Courtesy and Emeritus Appointments**

a) Courtesy appointments (no salary) are not a specified category by the University rules. Courtesy appointments may be made to any regular University faculty from other tenure-initiating units whose substantial contribution in teaching and whose research interests enhance the mission of the Department. Courtesy appointments are considered an asset by the Department and will represent a mutually beneficial relationship to the faculty member and to the Department. These appointments are recommended at the discretion of the Department Chair after consultation with the faculty. It is also appropriate for faculty to suggest to the Chair individuals for consideration for courtesy appointments. Responsibilities of the faculty member could include, but not be limited to, teaching graduate or professional student courses, advising graduate students or serving on graduate committees, serving on departmental committees and/or serving as a co-investigator on a research project. Faculty with courtesy appointments will be invited to faculty meetings and are eligible to vote on all issues except Department Patterns of Administration, Workload Policy and Promotion and Tenure issues. These faculty members may also vote on matters when serving on ad hoc Departmental committees. Titles assigned to courtesy appointments must mirror those held in their major University appointments. Courtesy appointments will be reviewed annually by the Chair. Continuation of the courtesy appointment should reflect ongoing contributions. If responsibilities of the courtesy appointed faculty member, as decided by the Chair or GSC, are not met, the faculty member may lose voting privileges on graduate matters.

b) Emeritus faculty are: “persons who have served the University continuously as regular or regular clinical faculty for at least ten consecutive years who, upon retirement, were recommended by the Chair, the Dean and the Provost for emeritus status. Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters but may have such other privileges as individual academic units or the Office of Human Resources may provide.” [Rule 3335-5-19(D)].

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, the Chair may request input from the Promotions and Tenure Committee regarding

Emeritus recommendations. The evaluation for appointment to Emeritus status should encompass the overall contributions of the faculty member to his/her field of study and teaching and in the area of service; to contributions to the Department, College, University and Community. The Promotions and Tenure Committee will request from the candidate and from any other source deemed appropriate documentation to facilitate evaluation. All evaluations by the Promotions and Tenure Committee are advisory to the Department Chair.

4) **Procedures for Appointing Tenure-Track Faculty**

In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, tenure-track faculty positions will be approved by the Dean. Final decisions for all faculty appointments rest with the Chair. The process for appointing tenure-track faculty may be started in two (2) ways: by internal (Departmental) procedures or by external (College) procedures. Examples of the internal process would involve, but not be limited to, the hiring of new faculty when centrally held positions were committed to a Chair when hired by the Dean or when centrally held positions have been committed by the Dean for strategic planning or discipline specific reasons. The external process would involve, but not be limited to, the filling of faculty positions in Institutes or Centers such as the Heart and Lung Institute; the Behavioral Medicine Research Institute; the Neurobiotechnology Center; the Comprehensive Cancer Center; Molecular Life Sciences Initiative; or other strategic units that are deemed important and necessary.

a) **Internal Searches**

For internal searches (Departmental procedures) for appointing tenure-track faculty, the Chair will consult with the faculty prior to the appointment of an ad hoc Faculty Search Committee (FSC). The purpose of the consultation will be to assess the issues facing the Department, including considerations emanating from strategic planning or program review. These discussions will lead to a clear and precise charge to the FSC by the Chair regarding the qualifications, characteristics, and academic rank to be sought in a faculty candidate.

The FSC will be appointed by the Chair and will generally be composed of faculty with expertise in the area(s) of recruitment. Usually a qualified graduate student will also be appointed to the Committee. The Departmental Chair will appoint one member of the FSC as its Chairperson, and the committee will designate one member at the initial meeting to be the Affirmative Action Designee. The latter individual will evaluate all steps of the search process in terms of the goals and principles of affirmative action, including the position advertisement and ensuring that the search committee does not engage in discriminatory practices. It is hoped that each member of a

search committee will become an advocate for affirmative action and nondiscrimination.

For the purpose of advertisement, the FSC will develop a position description based on the guidelines provided by the Chair. The position description should identify the functions of the position including the required and desired qualifications of the candidate. Position description criteria would generally address the desired type of training and experience of applicants and indicators of potential expertise for advancing the Department's mission and goals. Since the search will be conducted in a national arena, vigorous efforts will be made to submit advertisements in appropriate national and local publications and to identify individuals, institutions and agencies to receive position announcements. In organizing the search process, time lines will be developed including application deadlines, interview schedules, and target dates for submitting recommendations.

The FSC will create a diverse pool of applicants, review and evaluate all external letters of recommendation, identify the strengths and weaknesses of all candidates and provide recommendations to the Chair of the Department for on-site interviews. The FSC will also complete all necessary documentation on the search. Individuals being considered for tenure-track faculty positions will provide a CV for review by the faculty and present a research seminar to which the faculty will be invited. Following on-site interviews, the faculty in the Department will be consulted for input. Final recommendations for appointment will be made by the FSC to the Department Chair. The FSC will also recommend the level for appointment.

All offers at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Education. At the conclusion of the search process, the Chair of the Department will direct the Chair of the FSC to inform, in writing, those candidates not selected.

b) External Searches

Candidates identified by the Dean for faculty positions within an Institute, Center or other strategic unit, may be considered for appointment in the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics. The faculty candidate's expertise should fit with the overall Departmental missions and goals. The candidate's CV will be made available to the faculty for review and representative departmental faculty members will be placed, whenever feasible, on the itinerary when the candidate visits the University. When appropriate, a research seminar will be presented by the candidate and

department faculty will be informed of the seminar. The Chair will seek feedback from the faculty in regard to the candidate.

5) Procedures for Appointing Auxiliary Faculty

The Chairperson will consult with the regular faculty regarding recommendations for appointing auxiliary faculty to cover Department teaching and service obligations during periods when faculty replacements are necessary. Such consultations may result in the need to create a faculty ad hoc search committee. Candidates for auxiliary faculty status must have credentials comparable to regular faculty of equivalent rank and the proposed duties of the position must indicate that the Department will benefit from either significant teaching responsibilities in professional or graduate courses, or in defined service responsibilities.

Individuals being considered for auxiliary positions will provide, when appropriate, a CV for review by the faculty and present a seminar before the Department. Review of all auxiliary appointments will be based upon evidence of continued significant and satisfactory contributions. Evaluation of auxiliary faculty will be conducted on an annual basis by the Chair.

Adjunct faculty appointments are not compensated (no salary). Visiting faculty appointments may be compensated on a noninstructional budget and do not require prior University approval. Procedures for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as for promotion of regular faculty.

6) Procedures for Appointing Courtesy and Emeritus Faculty

The Chair will consult with the regular faculty regarding proposals to strengthen the departmental programs by appointing regular University faculty from other tenure initiating units to no-salary courtesy appointments. Individuals being considered for courtesy positions will provide, when appropriate, a CV for review by the faculty and present a seminar before the Department.

A decision regarding termination of a courtesy appointment will be made by the Chair after consultation with the appointee reveals that there are no longer any mutual benefits or that ongoing contributions by the courtesy appointee to the professional and graduate teaching, research or service mission of the Department are no longer substantial.

After consultation with the faculty and the Dean of the College, retired regular faculty members who still expect to make valuable contributions to the Department may be recommended for emeritus status. Requests for emeritus status should include a short statement of justification from the Department, with approval by the College.

Emeritus faculty are provided with an Emeritus parking decal by the Board of Trustees and are issued an annual University ID card validation sticker. Office and laboratory space are provided at the discretion of the Department Chair.

C. ANNUAL REVIEWS

1) University Procedures for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty Members

(Faculty Rule 3335-47-03):

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing tenure initiating unit, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

During a probationary period a faculty member shall be reviewed annually in accordance with this rule and with policies of the tenure initiating unit, college and university. The annual review should encompass the faculty member's performance in teaching, in scholarship, and in service; as well as evidence of continuing development. The involvement of tenure initiating unit faculty in annual reviews is strongly encouraged. External evaluations of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the faculty review body or tenure-initiating unit Chair. The tenure-initiating unit Chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. At the completion of the review the tenure-initiating unit Chair shall provide the faculty member and the Dean of the college with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The assessment should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. If the 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 fourth year review procedures and the Dean shall make the final decision in the matter. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

The fourth year review of probationary faculty shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion at the tenure initiating unit and college levels with two exceptions: solicitation of external letters of evaluation may or may not be

required by the tenure initiating unit and review by the college promotion and tenure committee shall be optional in all cases where both the tenure initiating unit and the dean approve the renewal of the appointment. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the college. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the tenure initiating unit's recommendation, the Dean must consult with the college promotion and tenure committee.

Probationary appointments may be terminated during any probationary year because of inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a nonrenewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with fourth year review procedures as set forth in this document. Notification of nonrenewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in Rule 3335-47-08 of the Administrative Code.

Probationary appointments may be terminated for fiscal or programmatic reasons. When nonrenewal is based on fiscal or programmatic reasons, the faculty member should be advised that such nonrenewal is a possibility and formal notice of nonrenewal should be provided as soon as possible after the need for nonrenewal is established. Nonrenewal of a probationary appointment for fiscal or programmatic reasons does not entail a performance review and requires the prior approval of the provost. Because hiring decisions should be based on informed assumptions regarding the future availability of resources and of programmatic needs, approval of such nonrenewals will be based on the extent to which convincing evidence is provided that the fiscal or programmatic reasons for the nonrenewal could not be anticipated when the appointment was made and are expected to be long lasting.

Decisions affecting the nonrenewal of a probationary appointment may not be arbitrary or capricious or carried out in violation of a 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 nonrenewal decision believed to have been improper. In that instance, however, the burden of proof is on the probationary faculty member to establish that the nonrenewal decision was improper. (See also faculty rule 3335-47-05.)

- **Exclusion of time from probationary periods (Faculty Rule 3335-47-03D):**

An untenured regular faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period for this reason must be made within the year following the birth or adoption and prior to the beginning of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The maximum amount of time that can be

excluded from the probationary period for the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six is one year. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted to the Chair of the tenure-initiating unit for forwarding to the Dean and to the Office of Academic Affairs. Such requests will be approved unless they are prohibited by paragraphs (D)(3) or (D)(4) of this rule.

A probationary faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful university faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, or service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted to the Chair of the tenure-initiating unit. Requests shall be reviewed by the tenure-initiating unit promotion and tenure committee which shall advise the tenure-initiating unit Chair regarding their appropriateness. Such requests require approval by the tenure-initiating unit Chair, Dean, and Provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to the beginning of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.

A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a nonrenewal notice has been issued nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the university's right not to renew a probationary appointment.

The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period for any reason or combination of reasons is one year for an instructor, two years for assistant professor (including time spent as an instructor) and one year for an associate professor except in extraordinary circumstances. Exceptions require the approval of the tenure-initiating unit Chair, Dean, and Provost. Faculty members will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period for any of the above reasons unless their absence from campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical. For purposes of performance reviews of probationary faculty, the length of the probationary period is the actual number of years of employment at this university less any years of service excluded from the probationary period under the terms of this rule. Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted under the terms of this rule.

2) Departmental Procedures for Annual Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

There will be a formal review of all untenured probationary faculty every year. Annually, each probationary faculty member will provide a schedule of year-long professional and graduate level teaching for all courses to the Chair of the DPTC in a timely manner so that peer evaluators may be assigned. Probationary faculty will be notified in writing when the review will take place, and given a deadline by which to submit materials for consideration in the review process. Reviews will generally take place during the spring quarter of each year. The review will be conducted by the DPTC and will consist of a meeting between the faculty member and the members of the DPTC. The Departmental faculty are committed to making the reviews constructive and candid, a means to be supportive and helpful to probationary faculty members. In order for the candidate to make acceptable progress, there needs to be candid and clear communication about aspects of performance that need improvement. There will typically not be votes taken during a non-mandatory annual review. However, if during an annual review process, it becomes apparent that a candidate could stand for early promotion consideration or that a candidate's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor, a motion may be entertained. A summary of the results of the DPTC review will be prepared and submitted to the Chair. The Chair will conduct an independent review of the faculty member's dossier and will meet with the individual to review the report of the DPTC and the Chair's evaluation. The faculty member will be provided with copies of both reports, which will become part of the dossier. The faculty member may respond in writing to either of the reports which will also be included in the dossier. If the opinion of the Chair differs from the opinion of the DPTC, the Chair will communicate the reasons for his/her opinion in writing to the Committee members.

The fourth-year review will differ from other annual reviews in requiring a departmental vote for either renewal or non-renewal and requiring college-level review. In the fourth year, it will be the Dean who makes the final decision on reappointment for the fifth year. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the departmental recommendation, the Dean will consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. In the first, second, third and fifth years, a department chair's decision to reappoint faculty member is final. If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, a the comments process must be followed and the case forwarded to the College for College-level review. The dean makes the final decision in the matter.

3) Department Procedures for Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

The purpose of the annual review for tenured faculty is to assist in developing and carrying out professional plans, discussing accomplishments, identifying performance problems should they exist, evaluating accomplishments for promotion,

and serving as the basis for annual salary recommendations. Annually, each tenured faculty member below the rank of Professor will provide a schedule of year-long professional and graduate level teaching for all courses to the Chair of the DPTC in a timely manner so that peer evaluators may be assigned. Each year after February 1, all faculty will submit an Annual Report to the Chair and those faculty below the rank of Professor who desire to be evaluated for promotion in the near future may submit a completed dossier to the Chair of the DPTC. In addition to submitting the complete dossier outline in the format provided by the Office of Academic Affairs (see Appendix III), a current curriculum vitae, summary of student and peer evaluations of teaching, and critiques from extramural and intramural research grant proposals should also be submitted. Faculty at the rank of Professor may substitute the documentation items for Annual Faculty Report (see Appendix IV).

Similar procedures as outlined above under (2) will be carried out for review of those faculty at the rank of tenured Assistant or Associate Professor who desire review with the exception that votes for non-renewal will not be taken. A summary of the results of the DPTC review will be prepared and submitted to the department Chair. The faculty member may respond in writing to this report.

The Chair will meet with each faculty member in the department to review his/her Annual Report. Written feedback will be provided in the form of a letter summarizing areas of accomplishment during the past year and areas requiring additional attention during the next academic year. A copy of the annual review letter will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The faculty member may respond in writing to this review letter and both documents will be placed together in the personnel file.

D. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

1) Criteria for Merit Salary Increases

Recommendations for faculty salary increases are requested each year by the Dean of the College of Medicine and Public Health. The following represent general criteria for merit salary increases and are based on activity reports submitted each year by the regular primary appointment faculty.

Excellence in teaching will be assessed on the basis of student and peer evaluations and teaching awards. The quantity of teaching performed will also be considered. Excellence in research will be determined based on the record (quality and quantity) of peer-reviewed publications, grant support, quality and quantity of national and local grants submitted, national/international research presentations, and the faculty member's research activities. Excellence in service will be evaluated as leadership or service to granting agencies, journals, or professional organizations as well as local service on departmental, college, or University committees.

- A Outstanding:** Only faculty whose performance has been truly exemplary during the past year. Faculty in this category consistently exceed the highest of expectations in the areas of teaching, research or service. Faculty receiving an "A" ranking present a balanced record of national research funding, publications in high quality peer-reviewed journals during the previous year, are actively training graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, have excellent teaching and excellent service.
- B Very Good:** Faculty who meet all performance requirements in the department and who are viewed as performing very well in terms of their contributions to teaching, research and service. Faculty receiving a "B" ranking present a balanced record of 1) national research funding but are not publishing the results of their research findings at an appropriate rate or 2) may have no national funding but are publishing their research findings in respected peer-reviewed journals. These faculty train graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows, as well as exhibit satisfactory teaching and service.
- C Average:** Faculty who provide adequate teaching, research and service. Faculty receiving a "C" ranking have no national grant support, no peer-reviewed publications for the year, and satisfactory teaching and service. These faculty members may or may not be training graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows.
- D Below Average:** Faculty who exhibit below-average productivity and therefore are not eligible for a merit-based salary increase. Faculty receiving a "D" ranking have no national grant support, no peer-reviewed publications for the past 5 years or more, no graduate or postdoctoral trainees, and adequate teaching and service.
- E No Increase:** Faculty who exhibit low productivity and low quality teaching. Faculty receiving a ranking of "E" have no national grant support, no peer-reviewed publications for the past 5 years or more, no graduate or postdoctoral trainees, and unacceptable teaching and/or service. These individuals will receive across-the-board salary increases only if mandated by OSU budget guidelines.

2) **Procedures for Merit Salary Increases**

Weightings for each of the teaching, research and service categories is based on the Departmental Workload Policy (see section IV of this document) which states that departmental faculty spend on average 65% of their time doing research, 25% teaching and 10% service. Based on these percentages, the research component of a faculty member's annual report is weighted heavily. The above criteria is used as a relative yardstick in making salary recommendations to the Dean. At the time of the budget meeting with the Dean, salary equity adjustments are recommended, if appropriate and if funds are available, to bring a faculty member's salary in line with American Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC) averages. Since there needs to be some flexibility and balance in this system, outstanding productivity in one category will be considered in remedying deficiencies in other categories. For example, obtaining a College of Medicine and Public Health or a University teaching award, chairing a major College or University committee (Admissions, Promotions and Tenure, etc.), obtaining an NIH Merit award or awards received from professional societies in recognition of professional contributions would be some typical examples of outstanding recognition.

3) **Documentation for Merit Salary Increases**

Merit salary increases will be determined from an evaluation of the Faculty Annual Report (either the OAA Complete Dossier Outline or Annual Faculty Report (Appendix IV), current curriculum vitae, reprints of scholarly work, student- and peer-reviews of teaching (if applicable), submitted intra- and extramural research grant proposals with reviewer's critique received during the year, and a statement summarizing goals and plans for the next year. Optional items of documentation in determining merit salary increases could include: self-assessment by the faculty member of specific strategies for improvements in teaching and research, frequency with which the candidate's work is cited by others, evaluation of the extent to which pedagogical materials developed by the faculty person have been adopted by other faculty at OSU and at other peer-institutions of higher education, solicited evaluations of former graduate students, or assessment of the success of former graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. Recognition for salary increases will be given to research which is published (i.e., publicly disseminated and peer-evaluated) or officially accepted for publication.

E. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF MOLECULAR VIROLOGY, IMMUNOLOGY AND MEDICAL GENETICS

Reviews for promotion and tenure and for promotion in the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics will abide by Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 (D) which states that:

“In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the University enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.”

1) Criteria: Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

Reviews for promotion and tenure and for promotion in the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics will abide by Faculty Rule 3335-47-02(C) which states that:

“The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the University.” In addition, promotion and/or tenure reviews in the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics will abide by Faculty Rule 3335-47-02(B) which states that: “Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of Associate Professor.”

“The department (of MVIMG) (will) establish and exercise very high standards for the awarding of tenure since a positive tenure decision has a powerful impact on the quality and future of the department. Every candidate (will) be held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. The pattern of performance over the probationary period (must) yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

(In addition), a candidate (will) also be held to a high standard of departmental citizenship. It is expected that departmental faculty will behave in a mutually respectful and collegial manner. This means treating departmental colleagues with respect and working constructively on behalf of the department. Poor departmental citizenship and/or a lack of collegiality at best imposes additional burdens on other faculty and at worst may obstruct a department's ability to function and may damage

its reputation. Poor departmental citizenship and/or lack of collegiality are acceptable bases for a negative recommendation.”

Because of the unique mission of the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics within the University, additional comments are necessary to supplement and expand upon the published University criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure that are detailed in Chapter 47 of the Rules of the University Faculty. Faculty persons promoted to Associate professor with tenure are expected to have clear evidence of scholarly attainment in each of the three categories of research, teaching, and service. Since all promotions shall be made on the basis of merit, the following statements regarding each of these areas will serve as a guide to review committees evaluating the accomplishments of a faculty member.

a) Research

Research is an essential mission of the Department. As a basic science department in the College of Medicine and Public Health which is a nationally recognized research institution, innovative research of high quality is an expected contribution of faculty in the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics. Research is defined as activities leading to the publication of experimental data in journals listed in common scientific indices such as Biological Abstracts, Chemical Abstracts, Index Medicus, and Current Contents. Research provides discovery of new knowledge that will be the basis of practices and philosophies of medical care in the future. Creative research leads to professional growth and national recognition of faculty and also results in more innovative teaching by keeping the faculty person near the cutting edge of new knowledge in his/her discipline. It also enhances the attraction of superior graduate students to the Department. To function effectively in the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must have established an independent research program in their particular field that confirms their ability to make valuable contributions to the basic understanding of fundamental principles of microbiology, immunology and medical genetics, and by performing research activities as spelled out in the workload policy (see Section IV of this document). Publication in the form considered appropriate for the field will constitute evidence of successful creative and applied research. Evaluation of the quality of such publication is imperative, and specialists in the field from both inside and outside the University will be called upon to attest to the value of the individual's research. The existence of published research results in journals of high quality and impact is expected, as is close adherence to the guidelines described in the workload policy regarding the amount of published work (Section IV of this document). Since certain types of research or creative work require a longer period of development before publication than do

others, evaluation also should be made of work in progress. The awarding of patents will also be considered as evidence of productive research. Because of the expense of biomedical research, the acquisition of extramural funds is essential for providing the resources for equipping and maintaining a state-of-the-art research facility. Therefore, preparation and submission of competitive grant or contract proposals is a required activity by the faculty. The acquisition of a peer reviewed research grant, funded by a national governmental or philanthropic agency (examples: the NIH, American Cancer Society, NSF or others listed by the NIH) will be weighted heavily in promotion/tenure evaluations. Improvement in priority scores, positive comments by review panels and persistent efforts to address criticisms through repeated modifications and submissions are additional indicators of high quality efforts to obtain external funding. Although research is an essential mission of the Department, faculty will not be promoted to Associate Professor solely on the basis of research accomplishments.

b) Teaching

High quality teaching and advising of professional, graduate students and postdoctoral trainees is recognized as an essential Departmental function. Interdisciplinary activities or activities relating to undergraduate teaching are also performed by faculty in the Department when applicable and may serve as evidence of contributions in teaching. Successful candidates for promotion and tenure will have complied with the workload policy of the Department, as set forth in Section IV of this document, in the quantity and categories of teaching duties as specified. In evaluating the quality of teaching, the DPTC will consider the following: development of new and effective techniques, programs of instruction or curriculum development; documented innovative contributions to curricular revision in the Department and/or College; College or University teaching awards; successful mentoring of graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows, demonstration of activity on graduate student advisory committees, attainment of notable professional success by graduate students of the candidate; student evaluations of teaching performance; peer- and professional-evaluation of teaching performance by Departmental faculty based upon class visitations, review of syllabi, and critique of examinations. Although teaching is an important mission of the Department, faculty will not be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure based only upon accomplishments in teaching.

c) Service

Effective participation in activities appropriate to the formation of educational policy and faculty governance and effective performance of administrative duties shall be taken into consideration in the evaluative process. A service component is a normal part of a faculty member's

obligation to the University, and promoted faculty must have complied with the Departmental workload policy in fulfillment of service activities. Service to the community, state, and nation also will be recognized as positive evidence for promotion, provided that this service emanates from the special competence of the individual in his or her field(s) and is an extension of the individual's role in research or teaching. The DPTC will recognize the following as examples of outstanding accomplishments in the broad area of service to the University: appointments to editorial boards and as referee of high-quality professional journals in the candidate's discipline; leadership roles in major professional societies in the faculty person's field; appointments to grant review councils or study sections of federal agencies and private foundations; and creative accomplishments by committee assignments. An awarding of contracts, where remuneration is received for services rendered, are categorized as service regardless of the source of funds. Publications arising from this activity (other than progress reports, etc.) will be classified as research. If a student works on a contract project as part of the dissertation research, that student advisor's effort will be classified as teaching.

An important component in the achievement of outstanding service is Departmental citizenship. Successful functioning as a Department requires that there be a team effort in teaching and in matters of Departmental governance and administration. Poor departmental citizenship and/or lack of collegiality imposes additional burdens on other faculty and adversely affects a Department's ability to function. Proactive contributions towards the achievement of Departmental goals and willingness to cooperate with other faculty will be considered a necessary component of the profile of promoted candidates. Poor departmental citizenship and/or lack of collegiality are acceptable bases for a negative recommendation. Although service is an essential mission of the Department, faculty will not be promoted to Associate Professor solely on the basis of service accomplishments.

2) Criteria: Promotion to the Rank of Professor

As stated in Faculty Rule 3335-47-02(C): "Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service." In the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, faculty promoted to the rank of professor also should exemplify qualities which make them role models for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Specific criteria in the areas of research, teaching, and service, expected of candidates promoted to the rank of professor in the Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology are indicated below.

a) Research

The importance of research to the mission of the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics and the definition of its activities are described under the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Successful candidates for promotion to professor should have developed and maintained a high quality research program which is recognized as such in the national and international research community in the relevant area(s) of study. Excellence in this area will be assessed by the ability of the candidate to achieve sustained national peer-reviewed funding for their program(s), consistent and timely publication of research results in journals of high quality and impact, and in accordance with the departmental workload policy (Section IV of this document), the awarding of patents and licensing agreements for patents (when relevant), recognition of research expertise at the national and international level (through invitations to provide seminars or talks at other institutions and/or national and international meetings, by chairing sessions at and/or organizing national and international meetings, by assignment to editorial or review boards, and/or by other activities which reflect the high regard of the faculty member's previous and/or current research programs), and by the positive and enthusiastic evaluation of the faculty member's research program(s) by nationally and internationally recognized experts in the relevant area(s) of study. Faculty will not be promoted to the rank of professor based only on accomplishments in research.

b) Teaching

Successful candidates for promotion to the rank of professor will have complied with the departmental workload policy (see Section IV of this document) in the quantity and categories of teaching as specified. In addition, the faculty member should demonstrate sustained excellence in the quality of didactic teaching as determined by both student and peer evaluations, reviews of syllabi, and critiques of examinations. Excellence in graduate curriculum development in the faculty member's area of expertise also is expected. Excellence in interdisciplinary activities or activities related to undergraduate teaching, when relevant, will be considered. Evaluation of informal instruction, such as graduate student and postdoctoral training and service on student advisory committees will be based on the extent as well as quality of such instruction. Quality measures of informal instruction could include but not be limited to the following:

requests for letters from former students/postdoctoral fellows
number of students/postdoctoral fellows trained
progress of students/postdoctoral fellows through their programs of
study

awards to trainees
positions acquired by previous trainees
publication record of trainees

Faculty will not be promoted to the rank of professor based solely on performance and accomplishments in teaching.

c) Service

Successful candidates for promotion to professor should have provided consistent and high quality service to the Department, College, and University, to the extent which not only meets, but exceeds the level dictated by the workload policy (see Section IV of this document). Proactive contributions toward the achievement of the Department's mission and goals and the willingness to cooperate with other faculty to these ends will be expected for faculty promoted to the rank of professor. Good departmental citizenship as defined under criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure will be expected. Faculty members who are successful candidates for promotion to professor are expected to have provided leadership in some of their service roles (such as chairing committees, service in an administrative post, or similar leadership position). When appropriate, quality indicators of service could include the overt results of such service, or evaluation of the service by individual(s) familiar with the service activities of the faculty member. Faculty will not be promoted to the rank of professor based solely on service accomplishments.

3) Procedures

a) Probationary Service and Duration of Appointments for Regular Faculty

As quoted from Faculty Rule 3335-47-03, "Probationary periods are established for regular faculty members. During a probationary period a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually." Refer to Section VIIB on Appointments for Regular Faculty for lengths of probationary periods.

1) As stated in Faculty Rule 3335-47-03, "Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of faculty rule 3335-47-08 and the provisions of paragraphs (G), (H), and (I) of this rule."

2) “Probationary faculty members will be informed no later than the end of the year in which their mandatory review for tenure takes place as to whether tenure will be granted by the beginning of the following year. If tenure is not granted, a one year terminal year of employment is offered.”

3) “Service credit of up to three years may be granted for prior work experience at the time of the initial appointment and requires the approval of the tenure-initiating unit Chair, Dean, and Provost. Prior service credit shortens a probationary period by the amount of the credit and once granted cannot be revoked except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period. Prior service credit will not be granted for employment in any auxiliary title (such as adjunct, visiting, clinical, or lecturer), special title (such as graduate associate) or part-time position (less than 50 percent service).”

4) “Probationary regular faculty members on less than full-time service for part or all of their probationary period may request an extension of the probationary period. The extension must be requested prior to the beginning of the year in which the normally scheduled mandatory review for tenure would take place and requires approval of the tenure-initiating unit Chair, Dean, and Provost. The extension shall be for an integral number of years based on the principle that the usual probationary period represents full-time service. The maximum permissible extension of a probationary period under this paragraph is one year for a probationary instructor, three years for a probationary assistant professor (including time spent at the rank of instructor) and one year for a probationary associate professor or professor.”

b) Process of Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure Reviews

1) Nomination for Promotion and/or Tenure

A faculty member may be nominated for promotion by him/herself, by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, by a member of the regular faculty or by the Department Chair.

Faculty with cross-appointments in the Department are considered for promotion at the same time as in their primary department. In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-47-04(A)3, “the review for tenure during the final year of a probationary period is mandatory and must take place. A faculty member may ask to be considered for nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if

the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The promotion and tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.”

4) **Documentation Required for Promotion and/or Tenure Reviews**

a) **Candidate’s Responsibilities**

The candidate shall have primary responsibility for preparing, according to Office of Academic Affairs guidelines issued each year, a dossier documenting his or her accomplishments. An example of the contents of this core dossier is included as Appendix II of this document, but candidates should obtain the most current guidelines provided by the Office of Academic Affairs." The outline must be followed exactly as it is set forth in these materials. The Procedures Oversight Designee must assure that the dossier is correctly prepared and does not include extraneous or inaccurate information before sending it forward to subsequent levels of review." Checklists for use by both the candidate and the Designee are provided as Appendices III and I, respectively. In addition, the candidate is responsible for submitting an updated curriculum vitae, copies of three of his/her most significant publications, and suggestions for not more than five external evaluators with whom they have had no significant personal or professional affiliation. Candidates also may submit the names of up to two individuals for exclusion from the list of external evaluators. These individuals will not be contacted. All documentation must be submitted by the deadlines published each year by the chair of the Promotions and Tenure Committee, but approximate dates are included in Section VII E 10 of this document. The Promotions and Tenure Committee may elect not to review a candidate for nonmandatory review for failure of the candidate to meet the deadlines. Candidates for mandatory review who do not adhere to published deadlines for submission of documentation at the discretion of the committee may be reviewed based upon the most recent information available (e.g., the previous annual review).

b) **Responsibilities of the Promotions and Tenure Committee**

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-47-04(B)3, the Promotions and Tenure Committee in the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics “shall be responsible for gathering internal evidence of the quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service from students and peers, as appropriate,” from within the Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, College of Medicine and Public Health, and University. It is appropriate for the committee to consult the candidate for suggestions of appropriate individuals to provide evaluation of teaching,

research, and/or service from within the University community. However, all requests for evaluation and/or input must be made by the Promotions and Tenure Committee or by the Chair of the Department. The Promotion and Tenure Committee “shall also be responsible for obtaining letters from external evaluators and from other units at this university in which the candidate has appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not. Some of the external evaluators should be suggested by the candidate and some by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.” At his or her discretion, the Department Chair may request additional external letters of evaluation. The mechanism for obtaining names of individuals from whom the committee may solicit external evaluations is flexible, but may include selection from individuals cited by the candidate in publications and grant applications, senior authors on publications found in literature searches in the candidate’s declared area(s) of expertise, and/or verbal or written suggestions of known experts (within or outside the University) in the area(s) of the candidate’s expertise). The letter soliciting external evaluations, with names and addresses deleted, will be given to the candidate for comment before being sent to outside reviewers. Also in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-47-04(b)3, “ No more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier will be from persons suggested by the candidate.” Therefore, more than one-half of the letters will be solicited from persons not suggested by the candidate. “All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier.” Generally, attempts will be made to obtain at least six letters of evaluation from external sources. “Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the above authorized persons may not be included in the dossier.”

The procedure for obtaining external evaluations is as follows:

- 1) The candidate will generate a list of up to two individuals for exclusion from the list of external evaluators.
- 2) "The Promotion and Tenure Committee will generate a lengthy list of potential evaluators. These will normally be faculty at peer institutions who are in a position to comment in an informed way both on the quality of the faculty member's scholarly work and on its significance to the broader field in which it resides. They should not be former advisers, collaborators, close personal friends, or otherwise have a relationship with the faculty member that could reduce objectivity. Letters from collaborators may be appropriate as a means of determining a faculty member's contributions to joint work, but such persons should not be asked for a letter of evaluation."
- 3) "The faculty member under review will be shown this list, will be asked to comment on the appropriateness of the list, and invited to

augment this list" with up to five additional names of individuals who meet the criteria for objective, credible evaluators. Unless the persons so identified do not meet such criteria and the faculty member cannot offer acceptable alternatives, the department will make every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from among those names suggested by the faculty member with the remaining letters requested of persons not suggested by the faculty member."

- 4) "The department Chair will seek approval of the tentative list of prospective evaluators for each candidate from the college administrator in charge of promotion and tenure reviews to minimize the risk that the selection of evaluators will subsequently be judged inappropriate."
- 5) "At least three months before completed evaluations are needed, the Chair of the DPTC will send out letters asking persons if they would be willing to write an evaluation. This letter of invitation will set forth expectations, anticipated due dates, and the realities of the Public Records Act. A self-addressed postcard will be enclosed on which the invitee can conveniently respond by a given date whether he or she will write. Those agreeing to write will then be sent all needed materials."

5) **Evaluation of the Candidate by the Promotions and Tenure Committee**

A meeting of the DPTC will be scheduled in October as needed and will be scheduled several months in advance of the meeting to ensure that all faculty members are available. A quorum as indicated in Section III C2 of this document will be required for all deliberations by the committee. All members of the committee will be provided with a copy of the candidate's core dossier, peer teaching evaluations, and internal and external letters of evaluation at least two weeks prior to the meeting for deliberation. Two committee members will be assigned by the Chair of the DPTC to present the candidate to the committee, one as primary and one as secondary reviewer.

a) **Deliberation Meeting(s)**

For the purposes of the deliberation meeting, the primary reviewer will make a motion for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate, as appropriate, which will be seconded by the secondary reviewer. The two reviewers will then summarize the dossier's contents together with their assessments of strengths and weaknesses. Members of the committee subsequently will discuss the candidate

and the relevant information provided. Following this initial discussion, identification of areas of concern, items missing from the dossier, or questions which require clarification will be identified. The candidate shall be available and will be provided an opportunity to speak to the Committee if he/she wishes. The DPTC members may question the candidate on matters related to the dossier. The candidate will be excused from the meeting and further discussion may occur. Each member of the DPTC will then be called on by the Chair to provide input. Thereafter, a vote (by the committee-of-the-whole, i.e., all eligible faculty as stated in Section III C2) will be taken. A vote for or against the motion for promotion and/or tenure will be by secret ballot and will be recorded by the Chair of the committee. A simple majority is required for passage of the motion.

6) Report of Recommendation to Chair of Department

Results of the vote, numerically tallied, will be submitted by letter to the Chair of the department, together with a summary of reasons for the vote and separate, detailed evaluations in each of the areas of teaching, research, service, and external evaluations. The primary reviewer will prepare a draft report which accurately reflects the faculty discussion and vote, to be reviewed for accuracy by the entire committee prior to submission to the department Chair. If the vote is split (tie votes are permitted), both opinions should be represented and tallied in a letter to the Chair of the department. The entire draft letter will be reviewed by all committee members to ensure that the letter accurately reflects the DPTC discussion. The letter will be approved by majority vote prior to submission to the Chair of the department. This report will become part of the candidate's dossier.

7) Letter from Chair of Department

The Department Chair will consider all information available to the Promotions and Tenure Committee and the report of the review submitted by the Promotions and Tenure Committee and will submit a separate letter of evaluation which will become part of the candidate's dossier. As stated in Faculty Rule 3335-47-01(A), "Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in faculty rule 3335-47-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, or promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reasons that the recommendation was

judged not to be supported by the evidence.” In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-47-04(B)5, “As soon as the faculty report and Chair's letter have been completed, the candidate will be notified in writing of the completion of the (department) review” and will be provided with copies of these reports. “The candidate may provide the (department) Chair with written comments on the tenure initiating unit review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The promotion and tenure committee and/or Chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.”

8) Submission of Dossier to College of Medicine and Public Health

According to Faculty Rule 3335-47-04(B)6, “The (department) Chair shall forward the dossier with all internal and external evaluations, candidate comments on the departmental review and promotion and tenure committee and/or Chair responses to those comments, if any, to the Dean of the college.”

9) Termination of Review Process

According to Faculty Rule 3335-47-04(A)4, “Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the (department) Chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the (department), the Chair (of the department) shall inform the Dean or the Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.”

10) Timetable for Annual, Promotion and/or Tenure Reviews

February, March, April, May	Annual Reviews
June 1	Candidate CV's, Copies of representative publications, and grants due
June 15	Candidate exclusion list due DPTC external evaluator list generated
July 1	Potential external evaluators contacted with 8/1 deadline for postcard return
August 1	Candidate CV and papers sent to external evaluators
Early September (shortly after Labor Day)	Candidate Core Dossier Due
September 15	Due Date for External Letters

September 15-October 15 DPTC Review
November 1 Dossiers due in College office

11) **Summary of Documentation Materials to be Examined in Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

The completed core dossier outline from the Office of Academic Affairs shall constitute the basic standard of documentation for promotion and tenure reviews. Additional information to be included is as follows:

Teaching – Student evaluations of individual courses are required assessing such areas as preparedness for class, clarity of communication, extent to which the instructor generates interest in the material and the learning atmosphere. Faculty members are required to use the University SEI Form in courses for which they are generated. In team-taught courses, it will be necessary to have SEI forms generated for each instructor. It is the responsibility of the course instructor to supply the departmental office with the names of instructors needing evaluations. Every effort should be made to maximize student response rates. The collection of SEI forms cannot be under the control of the faculty member being evaluated.

In large multi-discipline courses where no SEI forms are generated (Med College 661, 662, 663, 664, and 689), instructors will be evaluated according to College of Medicine practice (evaluations automatically generated for lecturers giving 4 or more lectures). For those giving fewer than 4 lectures, the instructor should contact the appropriate Med I, II or III-IV office to arrange for evaluation. College of Medicine evaluation forms are supplied back to the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the faculty member being evaluated to provide University SEI Summary forms and/or College of Medicine Summary Evaluation forms as part of the P&T dossier.

Peer evaluation will be conducted each year for courses taught by probationary faculty members and every three years for associate professors. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the Chair of the DPTC with a schedule of year-long professional and graduate level teaching at the beginning of the academic year. The Chair of the DPTC will then appoint two peer evaluators for each course or series of lectures (in the case of large team-taught courses). The peer reviewers will visit the classroom and observe the faculty members at different times during the course or series of lectures. The peer reviewers will fill out a form generated for this purpose.

In evaluating the quality of teaching, the DPTC may also consider, if appropriate, the following: development of new and effective instructional techniques, programs of instruction or curriculum development; documented innovative contributions to curricular revision in the Department and/or College; College or University teaching awards; successful mentoring of graduate students

and/or postdoctoral fellows, demonstration of activity on graduate student advisory committees, attainment of notable professional success by graduate students of the candidate, and critique of examinations.

Research – Publication of research findings in high-quality peer-reviewed journals will constitute evidence of successful creative and applied research. Evaluation of the quality of such publication is imperative, and specialists in the field from both inside and outside the University will be called upon to attest to the value of the individual's research. The existence of published research results in journals of high quality and impact is expected, as is close adherence to the guidelines described in the workload policy regarding the amount of published work (Section IV of this document). The awarding of patents will also be considered as evidence of productive research. The acquisition of extramural funds is essential for providing the resources for equipping and maintaining a state-of-the-art research facility. The acquisition of a peer reviewed research grant, funded by a national governmental or philanthropic agency (examples: the NIH, American Cancer Society, NSF or others listed by the NIH) will be weighted heavily in promotion/tenure evaluations. Improvement in priority scores, positive comments by review panels and persistent efforts to address criticisms through repeated modifications and submissions are additional indicators of high quality efforts to obtain external funding.

Service - The following activities will be considered as examples of service to the University and professional community: appointments to editorial boards and as referee of high-quality professional journals in the candidate's discipline; leadership roles in major professional societies in the faculty person's field; appointments to grant review councils or study sections of federal agencies and private foundations; and creative accomplishments by committee assignments, either University committees or professional committees.

12) **Reconsideration of Cases by Review Bodies**

"On occasion, it may be necessary to reconsider a case after its preliminary review has been completed. Such reconsideration may come about as a result of procedural errors that are discovered during the comments process or as a result of the case being remanded to a lower level of review by a higher level because of perceived procedural problems or new information. The following procedures apply to reconsideration of cases."

a) "If a review body or unit administrator becomes convinced that a procedural error which could have affected the outcome of the deliberations has been made, that body or administrator should take necessary steps to correct the error at the level of review at which it occurred (department, college, University). The case should be fully reconsidered from that point on. If internal letters of evaluation and comments letters have already been

generated at that level of review and beyond, they should be saved but not included in the dossier. The new written evaluations should note that reconsideration took place because of a procedural error and state what that error was. The comments process must be repeated for the new internal letters of evaluation at the department or college level."

b) If significant new information about the faculty member's performance becomes available after a case has left the tenure initiating unit, a higher level review body may remand the case to the TIU. Following review of the new information (which need not take place in a meeting), the TIU deliberative body may take a preliminary vote to determine whether to revote the case. This preliminary vote can take the form of a ballot asking each member of the deliberative body to indicate whether the new information would change his or her vote. If one person indicates that his or her vote would change, the faculty will meet to discuss the case with the new information and revote. The originally generated reports will then be amended to reflect the content of the reconsideration and the new vote. In this situation, all previously generated reports remain in the dossier. The comments process must be repeated. Then the case proceeds to the next stage in the review process either for initial consideration or reconsideration."

F. APPEALS OF DECISIONS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION

Faculty Rule 3335-47-05. Criteria and procedures for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions and appointment nonrenewals and for seventh year reviews.

1) Appeals

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

G. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-47-05. Criteria and procedures for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions and appointment nonrenewals and for seventh year reviews.

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

"If the Dean concurs with the tenure initiating unit's petition, the Dean shall in turn petition the Provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the Provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the nonrenewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision."

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

APPENDIX

LIST OF APPENDICES

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Appendix I | Office of Academic Affairs TIU Level Checklist for Procedures Oversight Designee (see http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/xi_checklisttiu.html) |
| Appendix II | Examples of the contents of Office of Academic Affairs Core Dossier (see http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/xi_dossier.html) |
| Appendix III | Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Checklist (see http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/xi_checklistfac.html) |
| Appendix IV | Annual Faculty Report |

XI. PROMOTION AND TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW
TIU Level Checklist for P&T Procedures Oversight Designee
Updated 3/24/99

The TIU Level Checklist is also for use by colleges without departments since these colleges serve as the tenure initiating unit for their faculty.

Please complete an individual checklist for each faculty member under review.

This checklist should be placed in the front of the dossier before the case is forwarded to the next level of review (in the case of TIUs, to the college, and in the case of colleges without departments, to the University level).

Name of Faculty Member:

Name of Procedures Oversight Designee:

Items 1-4 of this list must be reviewed for each faculty member under review BEFORE the review process begins.

All problems must be corrected before the review process begins.

Items 5-11 must be monitored as the department review proceeds to assure adherence to department, college, and University policies and procedures. Procedural errors, particularly when likely to have affected the outcome of deliberations, are the primary basis for appeals of negative decisions.

Should you have concerns about any aspect of the review process, bring them to the attention of the person or body causing the concern.

Should your concerns remain unaddressed, bring them to the attention of the next highest administrator in the review process; that person must respond to you in writing regarding the matter.

1. ___ External evaluators meet Office of Academic Affairs requirements; no more than one-half of the letters in the dossier are from persons suggested by the candidate.

Read carefully the material on external evaluations in the 1999/00 Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (hereafter referred to as the OAA Guidelines--see [xi_guidelines](#)).

Ask to see the lists of prospective evaluators before they are invited to write to assure that prospective writers will be credible evaluators and that most are not persons suggested by the candidate.

2. ___ An external evaluation summary sheet has been included in the dossier listing all persons from whom letters were solicited; who suggested the evaluator; and indication as to whether or not a letter was received.

3. ___ The dossier has been prepared correctly and no extraneous materials are included, e.g. unsolicited letters, news clippings, etc.

The next three items focus on common problems in the core dossier.

4. ___ The faculty member has followed instructions for Item 6 of the core dossier outline.

5. ___ The faculty member has followed all the instructions for Item 12 of the core dossier outline.

Many dossiers are sent back for amendment because faculty members do not explain fully the nature of their contributions to collaborative work and/or do not list authorship on papers as it appeared in the publications.

6. ___ The faculty member has followed all the instructions for Item 16 of the core dossier outline.

Same problems as for Item 12 noted above.

7. ___ Written department procedures for reviews have been followed.

Read the department document carefully. Sometimes departments deviate from written procedures without realizing it.

8. ___ Procedures set forth in the 1999/00 OAA Guidelines have been followed except where they are noted to be optional or "suggested." The entire OAA document should be read carefully.

9. ___ All faculty members under review have been treated the same way during the review process except when there are clear and defensible bases for differences. Examples:

When neither of two faculty members under review for promotion to full professor has advised doctoral students but one is criticized for this and the other is not, there should be a clear rationale for the apparent inconsistency.

If letters from former graduate students are to be solicited, they should be solicited for all faculty members under review who have such students and not just for some.

If the department permits one faculty member to amend his or her dossier with new information after the review process is underway, then all faculty members under review should have this opportunity.

10. ___ Reviews have been based on performance and have been free of bias against underrepresented groups.

11. ___ The report of the department eligible faculty provides a detailed review of the faculty member's accomplishments and strengths and weaknesses along with the recorded vote.

Faculty Rule 6600.11. It stresses the primacy of peer review in promotion and tenure reviews; cases are sent back for rereview when this critical assessment provides an inadequate foundation for the remainder of the review process.

12. ___ The "comments process" has been followed according to the Faculty Rule. (See OAA Guidelines).

XI. PROMOTION AND TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW
Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Review Dossier Outline
Updated 3/24/99

At each level of the review process, the Procedures Oversight Designee checklist for that level (TIU or college) should be completed and placed at the front of the original dossier. (Copies of the checklists are not required in the dossier copies.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Original cover sheet (Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/ Tenure/ Reappointment) with administrators' recommendations and signatures and basic information on the appointment and review.

Biographical statement listing degrees and professional positions held with dates for each. This statement replaces the traditional curriculum vitae appended in the past.

II. EVALUATION

Only letters solicited by the chair, promotion & tenure committee chair or other authorized person may be considered in the review process and/or included in the dossier.

A) Internal letters of evaluation

- 1) Regional campus faculty (if relevant)
- 2) Regional campus dean/director (if relevant)
- 3) Division/department/school/eligible faculty or promotion and tenure committee chair

There **MUST** be a report from the full faculty deliberative body, when that body votes.

- 4) Division/department/school chair/director
- 5) Division/department/school chair/director and/or center director for units in which the candidate has a joint academic appointment

Letters from departments in which the candidate holds a purely courtesy appointment are optional.

- 6) College promotion and tenure committee chair
- 7) College dean

B) External letters of evaluation

1) Summary sheet listing:

- All persons from whom letters were solicited (by name and institution).
- *Who suggested the evaluator.*
- Indication as to whether a letter was received.

2) Copy of the letter requesting the evaluations. If this letter does not indicate what materials were sent to the evaluators, provide a separate list of this information.

3) External letters with a cover page (externalrev) for each evaluator in front of the letter indicating:

- Name, title (rank if in the academy), and institutional affiliation.
- Qualifications as an evaluator of the candidate.
- Who recommended the evaluator (candidate, chair, or other [specified]).
- Relationship to the candidate.

Persons who were asked to write, but did not, should be listed on the summary sheet in (1) above but they do not need cover pages.

C) OPTIONAL: Letters from research collaborators explaining candidate's and collaborator's contributions to joint works.

D) Other letters such as peer reviews of teaching or letters solicited from former students.

E) In the case of an untenured faculty member, all annual review letters provided to an untenured faculty member to date.

III. CORE DOSSIER

Please number pages consecutively within the Core Dossier.

Page 1 will be the first item in the outline below. All teaching evaluation data should be included when the core dossier is paginated; it is acceptable for these pages to be numbered by hand.

In the INTRODUCTION and EVALUATION sections of the dossier, materials should be ordered according to the above outline but do not need to be paginated.

In the review process, attention is paid both to productivity since date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent) and accomplishments over one's entire career. In the outline below some items state specifically the time frame for which information is to be provided.

When no time frame is provided, information should be provided for the entire career if it is germane to the evaluation, but dates should be provided for all activities and professional accomplishments so that those since the date of hire or last promotion (whichever was more recent) can be clearly identified.

You must include every item in the outline in your dossier. If a particular item is not applicable to

you, place those words under the item. Do not omit the item.

Present your accomplishments as succinctly as possible and in outline form to the extent possible.

Some explanation is valuable but lengthy narrative and explanation may obscure important accomplishments rather than highlight them.

Avoid self-evaluation except when it is requested. Assessment of the quality and importance of your accomplishments is most appropriately offered by others.

You should not look at dossiers from the past (including your own) for examples of how to present material as guidelines change and past formats may no longer be acceptable. If you are unsure about the content needed for a particular item, ask your department chair or P&T committee chair for assistance, or send a query by e-mail to Rudd.2@osu.edu.

Core Dossier Outline

1) Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Courses Taught Since Date of Hire or Past Five Years (whichever is more recent)

List each course taught and clinical instruction (see [courselist](#)) including:

Courses taught in chronological order by quarter (Au, Wi, Sp, Su) and year.

Course number, title, and number of credit hours.

Official final course enrollment.

Percentage of course taught by candidate based on proportion of total student contact hours in course.

Brief explanation of your role, if you were not solely responsible for course, including GTA supervision, course management, team teaching, etc.

Indication of whether formal course evaluations were completed by students or others by placing a check mark in the appropriate column.

If you have not obtained student evaluations in every regular classroom course, explain why you have not done so (such evaluation is required by Section (C) (14) of [Faculty Rule 3335-3-35](#)).

Do not include in this list extension, continuing education, or other non-credit courses.

2) Involvement in Graduate/Professional Exams, Theses, and Dissertations

a) Graduate student programs: give number completed and number current.

Doctoral Students (dissertation advisor)

For advisees who have graduated, list name of student, year of graduation, and title of dissertation

Masters Students Plan A (thesis advisor)

For advisees who have graduated, list name of student, year of graduation, and title of thesis

Masters Students Plan B (advisor)

Doctoral Students (dissertation committee member)

Doctoral Students (general examination committee chair)

Doctoral Students (general examination committee member)

Do not include service as a Graduate School representative.

Masters Students (thesis committee member)

Masters Students (examination committee member)

b) Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of graduate students for whom you have been the adviser of record.

For example, publications during or emanating from graduate program, awards for graduate work, prestigious post-docs or first post-graduate positions.

c) Senior Honor Theses: give number completed and number current.

3) Extension and Continuing Education Instruction

Summarize briefly the major instructional activities (workshops, non-credit courses, etc.) which you have conducted. Identify your role in the instruction and the number of participants.

4) Curriculum Development Since Date of Hire or Last Promotion (whichever is more recent)

Give specific examples of your involvement in curriculum development; e.g., role in the design and implementation of new or revised courses; development of new teaching methods or materials (undergraduate, graduate, or professional); creation of new programs.

5) Briefly describe your approach to and goals in teaching, and major accomplishments in

6) Evaluation of Teaching Since Date of Hire or Last Five Years (whichever is more recent)

Describe how the quality of your teaching has been evaluated; e.g., student evaluation of teaching, peer review, departmental surveys.

Describe how you have used these evaluation information to improve the quality of instruction.

Student Evaluation Data

1) For all courses in which you used some type of fixed response type survey (e.g. the SET, SEI or comparable department form) to obtain student evaluation information, two types of information must be provided here:

- a) A summary table (see setsei).
- b) Individual course summaries.

If you used the SET or SEI, include here copies of the computerized printouts you received for each course in which you used these instruments.

If you used some other fixed choice survey instrument, include here a page for each course that lists the statements to which students responded and shows the number of students selecting each response choice for each statement.

It is not necessary to include summaries of narrative comments that were obtained along with fixed response surveys. These comments do not lend themselves to generalization since they tend to be few in number and random in focus.

2) For all courses in which you used only open-ended evaluation instruments, someone other than you must summarize the comments on a course by course basis for inclusion in this section of the dossier.

Please ask your department chair to assign this task to someone; make this request well in advance of the deadline for completion of your dossier. Any faculty member or qualified staff member may create the summary. Please note in the dossier who wrote the summaries.

Please also indicate how many students were in the course and how many of them completed evaluations.

On each course summary (fixed choice or narrative) indicate who handed out and collected the instrument from students.

7) Awards and Formal Recognition for Teaching

List awards you have received for excellence in teaching. Nominations for such awards should not be listed.

These awards may include citations from academic or professional units (department, college, university, professional associations) which have formal procedures and stated criteria for awards for outstanding teaching performance.

To the extent possible, describe how awardees are selected and the extent of competitiveness of the award.

8) Academic Advising

Identify number and level of advisees seen on a regular basis since date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent).

Describe specific responsibilities in advising, e.g., direct enrollment, coordinating advisor, career advisor.

9) Advisor to Student Groups and Organizations

Identify name of group or organization and specific responsibilities as advisor.

10) Student Affairs Committees, Task Forces and Other Student Services

Summarize participation in student affairs programs such as fireside discussions, lectures to student groups outside your department, addresses or participation at student orientation.

List student affairs committees or task forces on which you have served as a member or chair.

Identify contributions to other student services not covered in the above categories such as counseling for physical and learning disabilities.

11) Student Services Awards or Formal Recognition

List awards you have received as recognition for your contributions to student affairs.

12) Provide a chronological listing of books, articles, and other published papers.

Only papers and other scholarly works that have been *formally accepted without qualification* for publication or presentation, or have actually been published or presented, should be listed in (a) through (g) below.

Works under review must be listed separately in (j).

Use a regular citation style with authors listed exactly as they are listed on the publication.

For items a through e, *whenever there is multiple authorship*, describe:

The nature of your intellectual contribution.

The approximate percentage of your contribution in relation to the total effort involved in the work, if your department requires this information.

Items f-j listed here do not need this information unless your department requires it.

Examples of required format for providing this information:

I designed the experiment (which was carried out by the graduate student co-authors), and wrote the article. (contribution 75%) (if required by department)

I identified the patients for the study, administered the drug regimen, reported results to the consortium and reviewed the draft manuscript.

I completed and wrote the literature review for the paper, shared equally with the co-authored in the analysis and interpretation of the data, and reviewed the complete draft manuscript. (contribution 50%) (if required by department).

Include as separate categories

- a) Books (other than edited volumes) and monographs.
- b) Edited books.
- c) Chapters in edited books.
- d) Bulletins and technical reports.
- e) Peer reviewed journal articles.
- f) Editor reviewed journal articles.

- g) Reviews and abstracts (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- h) Papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- i) Unpublished scholarly presentations (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- j) Potential publications in review process (indicate authorship, date of submission, and to what journal or publisher the work has been submitted).

13) Provide a chronological list of creative works pertinent to your professional focus, e.g. inventions; dramatic, dance, or musical performances; or exhibits of your art.

14) Briefly describe the focus of your research, scholarly or creative work, major accomplishments, and plans for the future.

15) Provide quality indicators of your research, scholarly or creative work such as citations, quality indicators of publication outlets (acceptance rates, ranking of journal or publisher), etc. (Individual departments should determine what kinds of information could be described here, if any).

16) Research funding

For items a and b, whenever there is multiple authorship, describe:

The nature of your intellectual contribution.

The approximate percentage of your contribution in relation to the total effort involved in the work if your department requires this information.

See (12) above for examples of how to provide this information.

Other items listed here do not require this information unless your department requires it.

a) List funded research on which you are or have been the principal investigator and specify the period of funding.

Indicate source and amount of funding and whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant.

b) List funded research on which you are or have been a co-investigator and specify the period of funding.

Indicate source and amount of funding and whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant.

c) List proposals for research funding you have submitted that were not funded.

Indicate the date of submission, the title of the project, the authors (in the order listed on the proposal) and to whom the proposal was submitted.

Indicate the priority score the proposal received if applicable.

d) List funded training grants on which you are or have been the equivalent of the principal investigator.

Indicate source and amount of funding and whether the funding is in the form of a contract or grant.

e) List proposals for training grants you have submitted that were not funded.

Indicate the date of submission, the title of the project, the authors of the proposal (in the order listed on the proposal) and to whom the proposal was submitted.

Indicate the priority score the proposal received if applicable.

f) List any other funding you have received for your academic work.

Provide the type of information requested above as appropriate.

17) List prizes and awards for research, scholarly or creative work.

18) List editorships of or service as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications.

19) List offices held and other service to professional societies. List organization in which office was held or service performed. Describe nature of organization, i.e., open or elected membership, honorary.

20) Consultation (industry, education, government). List specific activity and indicate time period in which consultation was provided, etc.

21) Clinical services. State specific clinical assignments.

22) Other professional/public service if not included elsewhere, such as reviewer of proposals or external examiner.

23) Administrative service. Indicate dates and description of responsibility.

- a) Departmental committees
- b) College or University committees
- c) Affirmative action and mentoring activities

d) Administrative positions held

e) Other administrative services to/for the University.

24) Major Academic/Professional Awards and Commendations (if not included previously)

TO:

FROM: Caroline Whitacre

DATE: March 9, 1999

In preparation for the annual budget meeting for purposes of salary raise determinations, please submit an updated **curriculum vitae** and the materials outlined below for the period March 15, 1996 through March 15, 1999 by no later than **March 30, 1999**. **Please note that the time period has been lengthened to three years to allow for a more longitudinal assessment of productivity, as recommended by the Office of Academic Affairs**

1. Teaching

- a. Didactic - include course #, credit hours, your role in the course, and number of hours taught
- b. Graduate advising - graduate students under your direct supervision, as well as graduate advisory committees
- c. Progress on course development, if applicable

2. Research

- a. Publications - include citations of those papers published or in press from March 1996 through February 1999. If you have papers listed as submitted, include a copy of the paper. Please do not list papers in preparation.
- b. Funded Grants - include title, funding agency, grant period, % released, annual direct costs, and indirect costs.
- c. Pending Grants - same as above.
- d. Research Seminar/Meeting Presentations - for the time period specified above at OSU and elsewhere
- e. Abstracts - include citations of those abstracts published or in press from March 1996 through February 1999.

3. Service

- a. Committee service at OSU (departmental, college, and university)
- b. Service to student organizations (Bennett/Landacre judge, etc.)
- c. National service (study section, grant reviewer, service to national/international professional organizations, etc.)
- d. Service as a journal reviewer
- e. Other service activity (consulting, etc.)

4. Other Accomplishments

5. Goals for the coming year