

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Neuroscience

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE 2

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION 3

III. Definitions

A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY..... 4

B. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE..... 5

C. QUORUM..... 5

D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY..... 5

1. APPOINTMENTS..... 5

2. REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE, PROMOTION, RENEWAL..... 5

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. CRITERIA

1. Tenure-track Faculty..... 6

2. Research Faculty..... 7

3. Associated Faculty..... 8

4. Courtesy Appointments 9

5. Emeritus..... 9

B. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT OF NEW FACULTY

1. Tenure-track faculty..... 9

2. Research faculty..... 10

3. Associated faculty 11

4. Courtesy & emeritus appointments..... 11

V. ANNUAL AND FOURTH YEAR REVIEWS

A. Annual Reviews for Probationary Faculty..... 12

B. Fourth Year Review..... 13

C. Probationary Period..... 14

D. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period..... 14

E. Annual Review of Tenured Associate and Full Professors..... 15

F. Research Faculty..... 16

G. ASSOCIATED FACULTY..... 16

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. Criteria..... 16

B. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS: PROCEDURES..... 17

C. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS: DOCUMENTATION..... 17

VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION

A. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-track Faculty

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure..... 18

2. Promotion to Professor.....	23
2. Criteria for Promotion of Research Faculty	
1. Promotion to Research Associate Professor.....	25
2. Promotion to Rank of Research Professor.....	26
B. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW: PROCEDURES	
1. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES.....	27
2. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES.....	27
3. ELIGIBLE FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES.....	28
4. DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES.....	28
5. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS.....	29
C. DOCUMENTATION	
1. TEACHING.....	30
2. SCHOLARSHIP.....	31
3. SERVICE.....	32
VIII. APPEALS	32
IX. Reviews in the Final Year of Probation.....	33
X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	33
XI. Appendices	
STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS (AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY	
PROFESSORS).....	34

NS: 9/7/99

Revised 11/17/99

Revised 10/3/01/NS/Admn/Neuro AP & T Guidelines

Revised 04/21/05/NS/Admn/2005 AP & T Guidelines

Revised 05/02/05/NS/Admin/NeuroAP & T Guidelines 2005

Revised 03/22/06/NS/Admin/NeuroAP & T Guidelines 2006; OAA Approved 5/16/06

Revised 06/12/12/Admin/NeuroAP & T Guidelines 2012; OAA Approved 9/13/13.

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure) <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>, the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>, 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 policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the department Chair.

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the provost of the University before it can be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that

mission and the missions of the college and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document the dean and provost accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

Note: Sections of this document in italics are quotes from the Rules of University Faculty. The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 which states, *“Each tenure initiating unit is responsible for establishing criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure that are consistent with this mission and for ensuring that every faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure recommendation is consistent with this mission.”* It is also the role of the faculty to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Evaluation of faculty must be carried out according to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 which states *“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.”*

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Department of Neuroscience is to strive for excellence in:

1. the conduct of research in basic and applied neuroscience, for the purposes of understanding basic biological processes as well as the mechanisms underlying disease;
2. the training of undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate, and professional students in the discipline of neuroscience; and
3. the provision of professional service for the general benefit of the life and health science communities and society.

The research mission of the Department is to engage in basic, translational, and/or applied research that will generate new knowledge or applications. All faculty will be responsible for the funding of their research programs through grant support, or other mechanisms, and will disseminate knowledge acquired from their research through timely publication and other scholarly endeavors including technology transfer. An important part of the research mission of the Department includes the participation of graduate, post-graduate, and professional students in the conduct of research.

The educational mission is to teach undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate, and professional students the basic and applied aspects of neuroscience. The graduate education mission encompasses research training of Ph.D. students. An important part of the educational mission of the Department is the instruction of graduate, post-graduate, and professional students in the conduct and methodology of research to prepare the students for careers in contemporary biomedical sciences.

The service mission is to disseminate knowledge and professional expertise to the biomedical science community and general public. Service includes administrative and committee activities in the department, college, and university. Public service includes the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

1. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department.

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

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

2. Research Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of research faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department, all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in the department, and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the department.

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department, all non-probationary clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department, and all non-probationary research faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (i.e. dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least

50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

4. MINIMUM COMPOSITION

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

B. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

The department has an advisory Promotion and Tenure (P & T) Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. This committee consists of all full professors in the Department of Neuroscience. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed by the Chair of the Department of Neuroscience.

C. QUORUM

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is 2/3 of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1. APPOINTMENT

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority (greater than 50%) of the votes cast is positive.

2. REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE, PROMOTION

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion, is secured when a simple majority (greater than 50%) of the votes cast is positive.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. CRITERIA

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

Of the faculty approved by the University, the Department of Neuroscience appoints faculty to the tenure-track, as research faculty, and to the associated faculty, as described below.

1. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Tenure-track faculty are defined as: persons with the titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor who serve on appointments totaling fifty per cent (50%) or more service in the Department of Neuroscience. *According to rule 3335-5-19 of the Administrative Code: Appointment decisions for 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.*

INSTRUCTOR

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (B) (1): 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 may be granted for time spent as an instructor if the faculty member requests such credit in writing at the time of the promotion. This request must be approved by the tenure-initiating unit's eligible faculty, the tenure-initiating unit head, the dean of the college, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate because prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

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.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (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 Neuroscience, an appointee at the assistant professor level normally will have a Ph.D. and a strong post-doctoral experience. Candidates for appointment at this rank will be expected to have demonstrated an initial level of accomplishment in the establishment of

a research career. This will be reflected by the achievement of journal publications and evidence that the research has had an impact on the field. Current research support will be essential.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OR PROFESSOR

The criteria for appointment at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor in the Department of Neuroscience will be consistent with those for promotion to these ranks as defined later in this document regarding criteria for promotion and tenure. All appointments to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor require prior approval of the dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OR PROFESSOR WITHOUT TENURE

An appointment as Professor or Associate Professor will generally entail tenure. In some cases, candidates for appointment at these ranks may be appointed without tenure for a probationary period as specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, Section (B) (1) (Length of probationary period). The 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.

Care in making these appointments will be exercised, especially if the probationary period will be less than four years. Requests for such appointments will be submitted for approval by the Dean of the College of Medicine, and the Provost. In the Department of Neuroscience, the length of probationary service for Associate Professors or higher will be reviewed by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee with a recommendation provided to the department Chair.

2. RESEARCH FACULTY

Research faculty appointments are fixed term contract appointments that do not entail tenure. Research faculty shall be engaged in research related to the mission and goals of the Department of Neuroscience.

Appointments of faculty to the research are made in accordance with faculty rule 3335-7-32 which states: *With tenure-track faculty majority approval, research faculty may be appointed by colleges that do not have schools or departments and by schools and departments in colleges that have such subunits.* See Faculty Rule 3335-7 for more information .

Research faculty appointments will require one hundred per cent salary recovery that will be derived from extramural funds. They are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected in high quality peer-reviewed publications. Contracts, agreed upon by the faculty member and the Chair of the Department of Neuroscience will be for a period of at least one year and for no more than five years, and will explicitly state the expectations for salary support. The initial contract is probationary. The Chair will inform the faculty member whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year by the end of each probationary year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be offered at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. In the event that a new contract is not offered, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

Within the Department of Neuroscience, research faculty may be appointed to any standing or ad hoc committees at the discretion of the Chair, with the exception of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Research faculty will not be eligible for voting on promotion and/or tenure for tenure-track faculty, regardless of rank. Research faculty will be eligible to serve on university committees and task forces but not on university governance committees. Research faculty will also be eligible to advise and supervise graduate and postdoctoral students and to be a principal investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the graduate school as set forth in rule 3335-5-29 and detailed in the graduate school handbook.

3. ASSOCIATED FACULTY

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

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

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

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

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

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

than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

4. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR FACULTY

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

5. EMERITUS

Emeritus faculty are faculty who, upon retirement, were recommended by the dean and the executive vice president and 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.

B. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT OF NEW FACULTY

The recruitment of tenure-track and research faculty to fill vacant positions will be based on a clear and sound plan for the programmatic future of the department and college and on a realistic determination of the availability of resources to support the appointment. The Dean of the college must give prior approval of faculty searches. In hiring faculty into probationary tenure-track positions, the department will be firmly convinced that these persons, given their training and record to date, will successfully meet the Department's, College's and University's standards for tenure by the end of the probationary period.

1. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The Chair will consult with the faculty in the selection of new faculty members. A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved in advance by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs. A faculty search committee will be appointed by the Chair when a faculty line becomes available. This committee defines Departmental needs for applicants to fill vacant positions, advertises for these positions, evaluates the qualifications of applicants, and recommends candidates. Following University guidelines, a member is designated as the Procedures Oversight Designee. The search committee will review the application materials of candidates who apply, and determine which candidates should be referred for on-site interviews. All candidates will be considered within the context of the ongoing search. Candidates invited for interviews will meet with the Chair, members of the search committee, as well as other faculty within or outside the department who would likely have substantial interactions with the candidate. These position openings will be advertised in the internal university listings of available positions, as well as national publications which offer the widest possible dissemination, i.e., *Science*, *Nature* or other publications appropriate to the professional discipline.

In some cases, faculty from other institutions at more senior levels will be identified or targeted as being especially good candidates for contributing to and enhancing the mission of the Department of Neuroscience. These candidates will be discussed by the faculty. Following the faculty consultation, the initial contact will be made by the Chair to determine if the candidate has any interest in an appointment in the Department. If there is interest, the candidate will be invited to give a seminar and to meet with members of the faculty.

Candidate evaluation forms will be distributed to all individuals who interview the candidate. The recruitment committee will tabulate the results and make a recommendation to the faculty as a whole and the Chair regarding the relative merits of the candidates. In making a recommendation, the committee will consider the candidate's curriculum vitae, a description of the candidate's research interests and goals to determine if they are in line with the research mission of the department, 3 letters of evaluation from individuals who are in a position to judge the candidate's potential for success in a tenure-track position, evaluation of a research seminar presented by the candidate, and personal interviews. The eligible faculty in the department will vote as to whether to recommend that the Chair offer a position to a candidate. The details of an offer of employment will be negotiated by the Chair, and the letter of offer will be submitted for approval by the College of Medicine prior to presentation to the selected candidate.

All offers at the associate professor and professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit must obtain prior approval from the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals will include prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2. RESEARCH FACULTY

The Chair will consult with the faculty in the selection of new research faculty. Initial review will be carried out by the P & T Committee who will make a recommendation to the Chair and to the other faculty in the Department. In making a recommendation, the committee will consider the candidate's curriculum vitae, a description of the candidate's research interests and goals to determine if they are in line with the research programs or goals within the department, 3 letters or evaluation from individuals who are in a position to judge the candidate's potential for success in establishing an independent funded research program, evaluation of a research seminar presented by the candidate, and personal interviews.

According to Faculty rule 3335-7-33 appointments to the rank of research assistant professor will be approved by a majority vote of the Department of Neuroscience tenured-faculty.

RESEARCH ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

The candidate for appointment as a research assistant professor should provide clear and convincing evidence that they have a demonstrated record of impact and recognition at a local or regional level. At a minimum they must have earned a doctorate or other terminal degree in the field of Neuroscience or other cognate area. In addition they must have: 1) completed sufficient post-doctoral research training to provide the basis for establishment of an independent research program; 2) produced an initial record of excellence in scholarship that is beginning to be recognized at the national level; 3) demonstrate potential for an independent program of research as reflected by first author publications in peer reviewed journals; 4) successfully competed for extramural funding or demonstrate a strong likelihood of achieving independent extramural research funding; 5) show strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks and 6) demonstrate an attitude which reflects adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors.

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The candidate must have a demonstrated record of impact and recognition at a national level, and has at a minimum: 1) exceeded the Departmental criteria for appointment as a research assistant professor; 2) met or exceeded the Departmental and College of Medicine criteria for promotion to research associate professor; 3) a record of accomplishment in scholarship as

demonstrated by having developed a body of research, scholarship, and creative work; 4) evidence of an independent program of research as reflected by first author publications as well as existing and continued independent extramural research funding; and 5) demonstrate an attitude which reflects adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors.

RESEARCH PROFESSOR

The candidate must have a demonstrated record of impact and recognition at a national or international level, and has at a minimum: 1) exceeded the TIU criteria for appointment as a research associate professor; 2) met or exceeded the TIU and College of Medicine criteria for promotion to research professor; 3) established a record of accomplishment in scholarship as demonstrated by having developed a body of research, scholarship, and creative work that is recognized at the national and international level; and 4) established evidence of an

independent program of research as reflected by first author publications and existing and continued independent extramural research funding.

3. ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Associated faculty appointments are initiated either by the candidate, or by a representative of the department responsible for a program (usually an educational program) in which the candidate is expected to have a substantial role. In the Department of Neuroscience, associated appointments are made by the Chair after consultation with the P & T Committee. Appointments may be made for periods of 1 to 3 years and entail no commitment to renew the appointment beyond that period. In order to confer associated faculty status, individuals must possess credentials comparable to faculty of equivalent rank. Faculty criteria will serve as a basis for evaluating the occasional associated faculty member who desires promotion.

4. COURTESY AND EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS

Courtesy appointments are made at the discretion of the department Chair after consultation with the P & T Committee. Continuation of the courtesy appointment should reflect ongoing contributions.

For Emeritus appointments in the Department of Neuroscience, the Chair may request input from the P & T 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 P & T Committee may request documentation to facilitate evaluation from the candidate and from any other source deemed appropriate.

V. ANNUAL AND FOURTH YEAR REVIEWS.

A. ANNUAL REVIEWS FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY

FACULTY RULE 3335-6-03 (C)

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.

(2) During a probationary period a faculty member shall be reviewed annually in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7-36 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 (see paragraph (G) of this rule) and the Dean shall make the final decision in that 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.

In the Department of Neuroscience, the Chair or his designee must conduct a review of all Assistant and Associate Professors twice a year to assess their progress toward promotion and tenure and for the purpose of salary recommendation. The Chair will conduct his review in June to correlate with salary decisions. The P & T Committee will carry out a separate review early during the Spring Semester to track progress towards promotion and tenure of all tenure-track and research Assistant and Associate Professors. Letters will be written by the Chair and the P & T Committee following their respective reviews of the faculty members. The letters will be reviewed and signed by the faculty member and chair. Letters from both of these reviews become part of the faculty member's permanent file. Both reviews will discuss progress in all areas of academic activity upon which a recommendation regarding promotion and tenure will ultimately be based. Copies of the letters will be sent to the Dean as well as the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs of the College of Medicine.

The review conducted by the Chair in June and the P & T Committee during Spring Semester is based on the faculty member's dossier as compiled in Research in View and/or a curriculum vitae, as well as any other material deemed appropriate by the faculty member, or any additional material requested by the Chair or committee. In addition, complete student evaluation reports of teaching as well as peer evaluations obtained from members of the mentoring committee should be included. The June review requires a meeting with the Chair. Discussion will focus on research, teaching, and service activity of the current year, but will include discussion of the previous two years' activity and comments of the P & T Committee from the previous two years, to ensure that trends in productivity, or lack thereof, will not be overlooked. The merit review will also include discussion of direct appointment salary recovery and its match to research and teaching activity, as well as current space assignments. Following the meeting, the Chair will provide the faculty member with a written evaluation and a salary recommendation. Salary recommendations will be consistent with College and University guidelines. The review carried out by the P & T Committee does not require the presence of the faculty member, although they may request to be present at the time of the review or to meet with any member of the Committee after the review process.

The Chair's recommendation for each faculty member's salary increase is given to the Dean's office and is categorized as high, average, or low. The exact percentage is determined by the Chair within published University guidelines and funding availability for merit and equity increases.

Another level of review in the Department of Neuroscience is conducted by the faculty member's Mentoring Committee. The intent of this meeting is to assess progress of the faculty member toward promotion and tenure or promotion. They may provide advice on achieving goals or in solving problems. They also serve to provide peer evaluations of teaching. This Committee consists of senior members of the faculty who meet formally with the faculty member annually. A report from the Mentoring Committee will be submitted to the Chair prior to his annual reviews.

Faculty members will have the opportunity to respond in writing to the letters written by the Chair, P & T Committee and Mentoring Committee after the completion of the review. The faculty member should read and sign the letter acknowledging agreement with the report and/or adding additional comments as needed.

The goal of the review is to recognize areas of accomplishment, and to identify areas in which improvement is needed. In the event that a probationary faculty member's progress is deemed to be less than satisfactory, the committee will consider the factors that have contributed to the insufficient progress. Where appropriate, the committee may recommend that the faculty member consider application for exclusion of time from the probationary period according to the provision of Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(D). In order to avoid conflicting advice regarding the academic progress of a probationary faculty member, the Chair of the P & T Committee will confer with the Chair of the Department. In the event of a divergence of opinion regarding the assessment of a faculty member, the Chair will meet with the committee to discuss and resolve areas of disagreement. Probationary faculty whose annual review indicates a low probability of ultimately meeting expectations for promotion and tenure will be so advised by the Chair, and a recommendation for non-renewal of the appointment will be made. A recommendation from the Chair to not reappoint a faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures.

B. FOURTH YEAR REVIEW

According to Faculty rule 3335-6-03-(C4): 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.

In the Department of Neuroscience, the fourth year review requires that the P & T Committee presents the case of the probationary faculty, pro and con, to the eligible faculty in the Department (i.e., tenured TIU faculty at a higher rank than the candidate). External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel

otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. After the meeting of the eligible faculty, a report of the faculty assessment, prepared by the Chair of the P & T Committee, including the numerical vote of the faculty is forwarded to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will prepare a separate written assessment of the case and a recommendation for the Dean. The report of the faculty assessment and the Department Chair's letter will be made available to the candidate, who may respond in writing. The Chair of the P & T Committee and/or the Department Chair, may provide a written response to any comments made by the candidate for inclusion in the packet that is sent on to the Dean.

C. PROBATIONARY PERIOD

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and tenure will not be awarded at this rank. Because faculty members in the Department of Neuroscience do not have patient clinical service responsibilities they will be 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. The progress of faculty members for whom the promotion and tenure review is anticipated to occur after the sixth year will also be formally reviewed by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean at the sixth year. The anticipated schedule of promotion and tenure reviews will be stipulated in the letter of offer. If tenure-track faculty in the Department are not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, a seventh and final year of employment will be offered.

Consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(B2), 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, consistent with the criteria set forth in this document. Similarly, a probationary period may be terminated at any time, subject to the notice provisions of faculty rule 3335-6-03 (G, H, I) and 08.

D. EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM PROBATIONARY PERIOD (3335-6-03-D)

In some cases extenuating circumstances occur which require additional time prior to mandatory review. All requests from faculty members requesting an extension due to extenuating circumstances will be reviewed by the P & T Committee. Their recommendations will be forwarded to the Chair who will give final approval. Exclusion of time from probationary periods within the Department of Neuroscience will be in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) .

An untenured faculty member on the tenure track will have time excluded 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. Department chairs or school directors will inform the Office of Academic Affairs within one year of the birth of a child or the adoption of a child under age six of a probationary faculty member unless the exclusion of time is prohibited by paragraph (d)(3) of this rule. The probationary faculty member may choose to decline the one year exclusion of time from the probationary period granted for the birth or adoption of a child under six years of age by so informing their TIU head, Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs, in writing, before April 1 of the new mandatory review year following granting of the declination. The exclusion of time granted under this provision in no way limits the award of promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory review year. 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.

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 must be submitted to the chair of the Department. Requests shall be reviewed by the P & T Committee which shall advise the chair regarding their appropriateness. Such requests require approval by the Chair, Dean, and Executive Vice president and Provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to April 1 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.

Except in extraordinary circumstances a maximum of three years can be excluded from the probationary period for any reason or combination of reasons for an instructor, an assistant professor, or an associate professor. Exceptions require the approval of the Chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President 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.

E. Annual Review of Tenured Associate and Full Professors

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the P & T Committee as described above for probationary faculty. The P & T committee submits a written performance review to the department chair along with comments on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The department chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

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

F. RESEARCH FACULTY

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

In the penultimate year of a research faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of the contract.

G. ASSOCIATED FACULTY

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

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

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. CRITERIA

The mission of the department involves instructional, scholarly, and service activities. Faculty members are expected to participate in all three endeavors. Given the individual circumstances of our faculty, the proportion of time devoted to each of these areas will vary. It is the responsibility of the Chair, in consultation with each faculty member, to assign individual workloads to assure that the mission of the department is fulfilled.

The Department Chair retains the duty of assigning salary and merit raises according to the workload policy. Productivity is the principle factor in determining salary and merit raises. **Scholarly activity** includes producing publications (e.g., articles in peer-reviewed journals, books, monographs, electronic media), grant applications, carrying out work supported by funded grants, and presenting at professional meetings and/or symposia. Faculty members are expected to be involved in sponsored research as a principal or a co-investigator and to publish annually in peer-reviewed journals. The average percentage of time faculty are expected to devote to scholarly activity is 50%, with a minimum of 30% and a maximum of 80%.

Instructional activity in the department includes undergraduate, graduate, professional, post-graduate professional (post-M.D.), and post-doctoral (post-Ph.D.) student education. Courses taught by the faculty include: 1) individual instruction (e.g., student advising, guiding student research, individual study, 2) participation in Medical Education; 3) formal lecture and laboratory instruction in the interdisciplinary graduate programs (e.g., the Neuroscience Graduate Studies Program, the Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology Program,

Integrated Biomedical Graduate Program, and the Ohio State Biochemistry Program). These courses are taught by either individual instructors or by a faculty team. Instructional activities also include creating, developing, and revising instructional materials including computer assisted instructional programs. The average percentage of time faculty are expected to devote in instructional activity is 40% with a minimal level of 20% and a maximal level of 60%.

Service activity includes administrative work (e.g., for department, college, university), service to the profession (e.g., reviewing grants and manuscripts, serving as an officer for professional organizations), and service to the community (e.g., local, state, national, or international). Service activity also includes heading teaching units and directing facilities or centers. Faculty members are expected to participate in both departmental and college governance. The average percentage of time faculty are expected to devote to service activity is 10%, with a minimum of 5% and a maximum of 30%.

Deviation from the average workload in any one of these three activities (instructional, scholarly, and service) shall be balanced through appropriate adjustments in the other areas. These adjustments will be made by the Chair in consultation with the individual faculty.

The above policy relates only to "on-duty" semesters and does not constitute a contractual obligation. Fluctuations in demands and resources in the Department and the individual circumstances of faculty members may warrant temporary deviations from the policy.

B. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS: PROCEDURES

Each faculty member must undergo an annual review utilizing the principles outlined in Section V of this document. The Department Chair will compare the faculty member's performance to stated expectations and to those recorded in the relevant Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, and then determine an appropriate level of merit salary increase (if any). Other rewards will be determined in a similar manner.

C. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS: DOCUMENTATION

Documentation for the purposes of determining merit salary increases will use the same standards as are applied for considerations of promotion and/or tenure. These standards are described in Section VII of this document, and may be augmented by additional descriptions in the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document of the Department.

VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION

A. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility 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. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

The awarding of promotions with tenure is an acknowledgment of excellence and future potential for preeminence. The decision is based on 3 elements including scholarship, teaching and service.

SCHOLARSHIP

Definition of Scholarship: *Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. The awarding of promotions with tenure is an acknowledgment of excellence and future potential for preeminence. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure occurs when a faculty member exhibits clear and sustained evidence of excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in one's field of endeavor.*

Achievement of a national reputation is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure. Evaluation of research excellence will take into consideration the faculty member's agreed on workload policy and the assigned research duties of the candidate. First and foremost, promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires excellence and demonstration of significant impact of the faculty member's research. Impact is the single most important criterion for promotion and is determined primarily by high quality research; however, quantity is not unimportant. Excellence is defined here as the attainment of high standards of quality and sufficient quantity of research activities to constitute a substantial contribution to the candidate's field. There are many indicators of excellence and impact. Indicators used by the P & T Committee to make judgments include:

- 1. Achievement of National Recognition and Scientific Impact on the Field.** There are several measures that will be considered as evidence of having scientific impact: (a) Publication as first or senior author in the field's highest impact factor journals, (b) citation rates (the number of times a paper has been cited by other publications), (c) the candidate's h-index, (d) the Eigenfactor (EF) score of the journals in which the candidate publishes, (e) invitations to speak at national and international meetings, (f) appointment to editorial boards, (g) invitations to write review articles, (h) participation on steering, guideline, or advisory committees of national organizations, (i) invitations to serve on grant review panels, and (j) receipt of national scientific awards.

Successful promotion will require the demonstration of impact, not just the potential for impact. For example, publishing a paper in a high-impact journal or receiving a grant are indications of *potential* of impact, and not necessarily impact *per se*. Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%), and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles; book chapters or reviews

alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion. The candidate's citation rate will be documented and verified by the POD; the dossier will contain a citation table that indicates the number of citations for individual papers published at The Ohio State University, as well as an overall career citation index. It is recognized that the citation rate for papers published within 1 or 2 years before review for Promotion and Tenure is initiated may be low due to the short time the work has been available. However, evidence that the work is well received would be supportive of the impact of the work, and would commonly be documented in outside expert letters of evaluation (see below).

Considered together, demonstration of impact and a national reputation is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure.

2. **Letters from external evaluators.** A minimum of 5 letters will be obtained from distinguished persons in the candidate's field as well as from persons who are in a position to critically evaluate the faculty member's scholarly work and comment on its significance in the discipline. The Department Chair, in consultation with the A, P & T Committee, should generate a lengthy (10-12) list of potential evaluators. The faculty member under review will be shown this list and invited to augment it with a few (2-3) names of individuals who meet the criteria for objective, credible evaluators. The Department Chair will obtain at least one letter from someone suggested by the faculty member; no more than 25% of the letters will be solicited from evaluators recommended by the candidate. The external evaluators should not have any conflicts of interest with the candidate for promotion (e.g., been a co-author on a publication, a co-investigator on a grant, a former mentor, etc.). All responses to requests for evaluations, as well as notation of non-responses, must be included in the dossier.
3. **Publications.** Publications represent the archival results of the faculty member's research program both before and since their appointment in the Department, and they play a critical role in evaluations for promotion and tenure. If a former mentor is retained as an author on the candidate's papers beyond the first year of faculty appointment, the reason must be clearly stated because it could suggest that the candidate has failed to develop an independent scientific career. Based on our Workload Policy, it is expected that faculty members will publish annually. The primary metric for evaluating publication records will be to determine whether the faculty member has established a consistent pattern of high quality publications resulting from work primarily conducted independently in the candidate's laboratory. These papers should be published in recognized, peer-reviewed journals. It is expected that independent, first and/or senior author publications or co-corresponding authors will constitute a substantial portion of the publication list. However, it is important to form collaborations. For promotion to associate professor, successful candidates would generally have a career total of 25-35 publications. In general, candidates are expected to publish 1-2 first or senior author papers per year as well as contributing as a collaborator on 2 other manuscripts. This would result in approximately 18-25 publications generated at The Ohio State University. This metric is consistent with those established by many of the top 15 Neuroscience Departments (see Appendix 1). These ranges are intended as general guidelines; however, faculty are expected to be on a trajectory to exceed these publication requirements at the time of promotion. The total number of papers can include collaborative studies in which the candidate is sought out because of her/his expertise. However, productivity that exceeds these guidelines does not guarantee a positive promotion and tenure recommendation if the research is not judged to be of acceptable quality or impact; thus, it is not advisable to publish the smallest quanta of data to enhance publication numbers. It is also possible that productivity below these ranges could result in a positive

promotion and tenure review if strong impact can be established for the candidate's independent research (see above for guidelines for demonstrating impact).

Because junior faculty who are just initiating their careers may not have a sufficient number of students and postdoctoral fellows in their laboratories to assist in conducting experiments, they are encouraged to be engaged with colleagues in collaborations. In any case, emphasis should be on the quality of the work as recognized by their peers and as addressed by the external evaluators.

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion and tenure decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements while a faculty member at Ohio State University. Overall, the number of publications required for awarding of promotion and tenure should be sufficient to document a faculty members' influence in discovery of new knowledge in their field and their ability to effectively communicate their data to the scientific community. Thus, quality and impact are the most important criteria for promotion, but quantity is also important.

4. **Research funding.** Faculty are expected to support their own (independent) research programs and to obtain salary recovery. The development of a competitive, innovative and distinctive program of scholarship is evidenced by acquisition of peer-reviewed, nationally competitive extramural support as a principal investigator, multiple investigator, or co-investigator. Similarly, status as principal investigator of a project or a program grant is an acceptable criterion for extramural funding.

Extramural grants from national agencies represent easily quantified documentation of research quality and excellence. The reviews of such grant applications also can be used as quality indicators. Consistent funding is desirable and considered the norm for full professors, but consistent efforts to gain support are essential. The principal reason for obtaining research support is to allow the work to progress. Therefore, the final arbiter of research success is not the amount of funding, but the quality and impact of the research program and its archival publications. Clear indicators of success will be for the candidate to be a Principal Investigator on at least 1 NIH or NSF grant with salary recovery. However, significant contributions as a Co-Investigator on additional grants or participation in a Program Project Grant are also recognized as valuable contributions to the research efforts of the Department and the College. If the candidate is a Co-Investigator on a grant, they should clearly state their percent effort and the significance of their role to the project. Other nationally competitive, peer reviewed funding sources recognized by the Department of Neuroscience include the Department of Defense, national charitable foundations (e.g. American Heart Association or American Cancer Society), industry, or federal entities such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and will satisfy the criterion for nationally competitive peer reviewed funding should evidence exist for a sustained record of funding from these types of agencies.

Faculty members are encouraged to collaborate with other investigators and may therefore meet the requirement for extramural support for their research as a co-investigator, co-principal investigator, or other comparable role. Funding through pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies for investigator initiated proposals, or as local principal investigator for multi-center trials also meets the requirement of extramural funding. Similarly, faculty members who generate support for their research programs through creation of spin-off companies also meet the criteria for extramural funding.

5. **Research independence and collaboration.** It is recognized that research collaboration is an important means for attaining new knowledge, and is encouraged. Fruitful collaborations usually involve important and recognizable contributions from each of the collaborators. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued, especially to the extent that a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding; or the individual input of the faculty member as a middle author is uniquely contributory and clearly evident. Further, it is important for candidates to identify how the collaboration relates to the candidate's own research program.
6. **Entrepreneurship**
Entrepreneurship is a special form of scholarship valued by the College of Medicine. Entrepreneurship includes, but may not be limited to, invention disclosures, software development, materials transfers (e.g., novel plasmids, transgenic animals, cell lines, antibodies, and similar reagents), technology commercialization, patent and copyrights, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements. Inasmuch as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, the College of Medicine will analyze these flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenues should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion dossier.

Research excellence alone is not sufficient for promotion and tenure.

TEACHING

Definition of teaching: Teaching is defined as didactic lecturing as well as other means of communicating knowledge of neuroscience to students at the undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral and post-graduate levels. The departmental teaching mission includes undergraduate teaching (lectures, laboratory, and independent study) professional teaching (medical,), graduate and post-doctoral teaching (didactic and laboratory instruction), advising, and mentoring.

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires a distinctive record of teaching and mentoring excellence. Excellence is demonstrated by positive evaluations by students, postdoctoral fellows, local colleagues and national peers. Teaching awards and other honors are also highly supportive of teaching excellence. A faculty member may also demonstrate a favorable impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development. Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching and research are valued. Teaching excellence is most commonly demonstrated through evaluations and peer feedback. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

Evaluation of teaching performance will take into consideration the departmental workload policy and the assigned teaching duties of the candidate. Voluntary teaching (seminars, interdisciplinary teaching, invited presentations, CME, etc.) will also be considered. Teaching

excellence can be documented by contributions to curricular development and/or revision, development of new and effective teaching techniques, teaching awards, student evaluations, self-evaluations, and peer review of curriculum/content (course materials) and classroom teaching (if done systematically over time with the goal of offering constructive criticism). Many courses taught by this department involve team teaching. The evaluations of peers involved in team taught courses can be a valuable addition to the teaching portion of the dossier. The evaluations by the course director also will be an important criterion for judging teaching effectiveness.

Both student and peer evaluations are required for promotion and tenure. Student evaluations will usually be obtained using the Office of Academic Services Instructor Evaluation form. These forms will be distributed using the posted guidelines. These evaluations will be prepared for all undergraduate, graduate and professional enrolled students and are to be completed anonymously and on-line during the last week of classes. To obtain a Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Report that meets OAA guidelines the faculty member should go to <http://www.buckeyelink.osu.edu/facultystaff.html> for a menu of the Registrar's online services. If a faculty member generates their own evaluation form, questions should be included to reflect clarity and relevance of presentations, organization of presented materials, ability to clarify difficult material and an evaluation of instructional media. In addition, students should be asked to rate the faculty member on whether the students would like more lectures from the instructor and whether they learned a great deal from the instructor. The faculty member under consideration for promotion and tenure will organize the material in the format as outlined in the Core Dossier Form. The scores for each question, as well as comments made by students on evaluation forms will be summarized by a third neutral party and included in the dossier; the name of the person summarizing the material will be included on each page. All comments must be included in the summary.

Peer evaluation of teaching will be performed by members of the probationary faculty members mentoring committee. Faculty members should make their mentors aware of when lectures are to be given and ask them to attend for the purpose of providing a peer evaluation. Another form of peer review may be derived from evaluation letters written by Course Directors or other team members in team taught courses. Peer letters should include an evaluation of course materials, an assessment of course objectives, a determination of whether the course material is current, whether adequate feedback is provided on exams and assignments and an assessment of classroom teaching performance. Other documentation of teaching may include an administrator's (e.g., Department Chair) assessment of the candidate's teaching load, contribution to the teaching mission of the academic unit, and contribution to curriculum development.

Finally, a candidate may provide a self-evaluation of teaching, as evidence of teaching quality. This self-evaluation should include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching, self-assessment, interpretation of students' and peers' evaluations, and description of specific strategies undertaken for improvement.

Graduate student teaching evaluations may be supplemented by letters from former students if solicited by the Department chair or the chair of the P & T Committee. Additional documentation of effective graduate teaching may be evidenced by the productivity of former students, participation on graduate examination committees and honors committees for undergraduates. Any other efforts that can be documented as enhancing student learning experiences also will be considered.

Teaching excellence alone is not sufficient for promotion and tenure.

SERVICE

Definition of Service: Service is defined as supportive activities which contribute to the operation of the department, college, university and the enhancement of the profession. National and international service provides evidence that the faculty member is contributing to the advancement of the profession and the goals of the university. Local service includes administrative and committee work for the department, college and university. Service to the profession includes editorial service to scholarly publications, peer review assignments, consulting, professional society service, organizing meetings / symposia. In addition relevant community service is expected such as giving presentations at local schools, serving as a judge for regional Science Fairs for middle and high school students.

For **promotion to associate professor with tenure**, effective service must be demonstrated. Evaluation of service performance will take into consideration the departmental workload policy and the assigned service duties of the candidate. Evidence of excellence in this area will include service as an editorial referee for high quality professional journals in the candidate's discipline; and would include service in major professional societies in the faculty's field; invitations to consult or review grants for federal agencies and private foundations; and awards for service contributions.

ANNUAL REVIEW INPUT

The annual review document generated by the AP & T Committee for each faculty member at the Associate Professor level will comment on each of the above criteria with respect to progress and areas for improvement. The overlapping categories given above provide a means to organize the attainments of individual faculty for evaluation for promotion. These attainments are meant to be compared to the University and departmental mission statements in evaluating the progress of each faculty member towards the rank of Professor.

2. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Promotion to Professor is an acknowledgement that the candidate has reached a level of excellence and pre-eminence in their field. The candidate should be able to show that the research program has benefited colleagues and students at the University and in the research community at large. The most important criterion for the awarding of promotion to the rank of Professor will be based upon clear and unambiguous evidence that the candidate has a sustained, eminent record of achievement recognized nationally and internationally.

There are many indicators of excellence and impact. Indicators used by the P & T Committee to make judgments include:

IMPACT OF THE RESEARCH Promotion to Full Professor will be based on evidence of continued excellence in research and scholarly activity since their promotion to Associate Professor. They should have attained an externally recognized, independent research program which has contributed substantially to the departmental mission and to the candidate's field of endeavor. The committee will look for evidence that the candidate has been recognized as an important participant or leader in the research community. For promotion to Professor, the candidate should have played a national leadership role or attained international recognition for their research. Such evidence should include awards from scientific societies, invitations to present research findings at other institutions and at national and especially at international scientific meetings, appointments to editorial boards or repeated invitations to review

manuscripts or grants, appointments as a member to national review bodies such as NIH study sections or scientific advisory boards, responsibilities as an organizer of scientific meetings, invitations to provide critical reviews of a research topic, and assignments as a consultant to government agencies and private companies. External evaluators' comments can also contribute to this category.

Specific criteria considered by the AP & T Committee in making judgments about excellence and impact will include the following:

1. **Letters from external evaluators.** These should be from senior scientists familiar with research in the candidate's field(s) of research who are qualified to assess the importance and quality of his/her research program and its published results. The same guidelines for soliciting these letters as described above will be applied.
2. **Publications.** The candidate must demonstrate that their research has continued to have a major impact on the field as evidenced by a significant number of papers published in journals with impact factors of 4 or higher. These should be peer-reviewed journals that have impact in the field(s) of study. It is expected that the faculty member will have a consistent record of high quality publications well beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor. On average, a candidate for promotion to Professor will have published approximately 25-35 papers since their promotion to Associate Professor. This will vary for individuals depending on their specific sub-discipline. Regardless, the number should reflect a consistent record of publication both as senior author and as co-author with collaborators. A further evaluation is the citation index of individual papers as well as the overall citations of the body of work. Evidence that the candidate for promotion has been instrumental in the research and writing of the publications should be provided by an annotated bibliography that indicates the individual contributions to each work. The number of publications that satisfies these criteria will depend upon their quality and impact on the field. Substantive review articles and books will be given consideration in addition to peer reviewed research articles which report the candidates own results.
3. **Research funding.** Another measure demonstrating impact of the research is sustained funding from national funding agencies which is an acknowledgement by their peers that their research is highly significant. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program including sustained NIH funding since their promotion to Associate Professor. At a minimum, candidates for promotion to professor must be a PI or multiple-PD/PI on at least one NIH funded R01 or equivalent grant with a history of at least one competitive renewal or additional new grant. Consistent funding of a research program by national agencies is taken as evidence of continued productivity and contribution to the field. Dossiers without significant and consistent funding from external agencies will need to be bolstered by evidence that such funding was not available, or that the research program was unique and not fundable by conventional means. In such cases, substantial evidence of attempts to obtain funding will be needed.
4. **Collaboration and mentoring.** Collaborations can provide evidence of mutual scientific accomplishments. Mentored students and postdocs can provide evidence that research training is ongoing in the context of the research program, and can also contribute to the teaching aspects of the dossier as described below.

TEACHING AND MENTORING

A record of teaching excellence as an Associate Professor must continue to justify promotion to the rank of Professor. Evidence for exemplary teaching includes teaching awards, outstanding student and peer evaluations, course or workshop leadership and design, a training program directorship, and organization of national course and curricula. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. Evidence that students and postdoctoral fellows trained by the candidate have obtained meaningful academic or other employment is also looked on positively. Another example of teaching include serving as a faculty mentor. The mentee(s) should provide an evaluation of the mentoring relationship.

SERVICE

For **promotion to full professor**, evidence of consistent service excellence is required. Evaluation of service performance will take into consideration the departmental workload policy and the assigned service duties of the candidate. Evidence of excellence in this area will include service as an editorial referee, appointments to editorial boards and editorships for high quality professional journals in the candidate's discipline; and would include leadership roles and elected offices in major professional societies in the faculty's field; invitations to consult or review grants; appointments to grant review boards for federal agencies and private foundations; and awards for service contribution. Exemplary service at the national and international level will greatly enhance the case for promotion to professor as will evidence of leadership roles in at least some of the service duties.

B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF RESEARCH FACULTY

Research faculty are primarily engaged in research related to the mission and goals of the Department of Neuroscience. They are not expected to teach or to have major service commitments to the Department and therefore will not be evaluated based on those criteria.

1. PROMOTION TO RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in one's field of endeavor. Such endeavors might include laboratory investigation, development of innovative programs, among many potential others. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued, especially to the extent that a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding, or the individual input of the faculty member as a middle author is uniquely contributory and clearly evident.

It is expected that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of 100% salary recovery from extramural sources.

Achievement of a national reputation is a prerequisite for promotion to Research Associate Professor. Objective examples of a national reputation include service on NIH or equivalent grant review panels, participation on steering, guideline or advisory committees, selection for service in a national professional society, invitation for lectureships or scholarly reviews, receipt of national scientific awards, external letters of evaluation and other measures of national impact.

The development of a competitive, innovative and distinctive program of scholarship is also evidenced by acquisition of peer-reviewed, nationally competitive extramural support as a PI or multiple-PD/PI or as co-investigator on several awards. Similarly, status as core director in a

program grant is an acceptable criterion for extramural funding.

Although funding by the NIH is highly desirable, it is not required for promotion of Research Faculty. Other nationally competitive, peer reviewed funding, including support from national charitable foundations (e.g., American Heart Association or American Cancer Society), industry, or federal entities such as the CDC and the NSF will satisfy the criterion for nationally competitive peer reviewed funding should evidence exist for a sustained record of funding from these types of agencies. Faculty members are encouraged to collaborate with other investigators and may therefore meet the requirement for extramural support for their research as a co-investigator on NIH awards, or other comparable roles on awards from private foundations. Funding through pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies for investigator initiated proposals, or as local principal investigator for multi-center trials also meets the requirement of extramural funding. Similarly, faculty members who generate support for their research programs through their contribution to the creation of patents with associated license-derived income or spin-off companies also meet the criteria for extramural funding.

Entrepreneurship, as described above, is a special form of scholarship valued by the College of Medicine. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion dossier for Research Faculty.

2. PROMOTION TO RESEARCH PROFESSOR

The awarding of promotion to the rank of research professor must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national or international level of impact and recognition. For promotion to Research Professor the candidate will be evaluated based on the Scholarship criteria described above for promotion to Professor for tenure-track faculty. In general, a sustained record of external funding and an enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as a Research Associate Professor is required for promotion to the rank of Research Professor. Clear evidence of national leadership and/or an international reputation must be achieved. Objective criteria relating to leadership include, but are not limited to, election or appointment to a national office, service as a national committee or task force chair, chair of a review panel, peer recognition or awards, and editorships. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program

B. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEW: PROCEDURES

Each Department must describe in detail the procedures for promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews, as part of its Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document. These procedures must be fully consistent with those set forth in University Rule [3335-6-04](#) and with the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in [Volume 3](#) of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. The basic requirements for promotion and tenure reviews in the Department of Neuroscience are outlined in the following paragraphs.

In evaluating a candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility will be exercised, balancing (where appropriate) heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area of performance against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. As the College enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary involvement, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of a faculty member may depart from established academic patterns.

Generally, distinguished achievement in scholarship must include evidence of creative expression and innovation in the candidate's discipline.

1. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES

a. Candidates are responsible for utilizing Research in View to submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

b. Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

2. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

The recommended responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

a. This Committee does not vote on the suitability of candidates for promotion and tenure, but rather is responsible for presenting the case, pro and con, to the eligible faculty

b. When faculty are being considered for promotion and tenure or promotion, a Procedural Oversight Designee (POD) will be selected from among the committee members to work with the faculty member. The POD cannot be the chair of the P & T Committee.

c. The committee will review all assistant and associate professors on an annual basis as the designee of the Chair and provide feedback on their progress toward promotion and tenure and for promotion, respectively. This review will take place during Spring semester. A letter will be written by the committee summarizing their review. The faculty member will have the opportunity to respond to the review and correct, add to, or clarify any statements made in the letters. These letters will become part of the permanent file of the faculty member and will be included in the packet as Internal Evaluations at the time of mandatory or non-mandatory reviews.

d. Serve in a screening capacity for those faculty who request a non-mandatory review to judge whether their accomplishments warrant such a review. A tenured or non-probationary faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful. This is according to Faculty Rule 3335-6-04-A3 which states "*A faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory 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 non-mandatory 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 one year.*"

A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

- e. To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- f. Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process.

3. ELIGIBLE FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

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

- 1. To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- 2. To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote by written ballot
- 3. Eligible faculty not present for the discussion may send comments, but will not be allowed to vote on the candidate. The results of the vote will be included in a letter written by the chair of the committee and forwarded to the Chair of the Department of Neuroscience and the College of Medicine.

4. DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- a. Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty are not eligible for tenure or tenure review if they do not have citizenship or permanent residency status.
- b. Late Spring Semester: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- c. To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any department with which the candidate has a joint appointment.
- d. To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- e. To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- f. To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- g. To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair, the availability for

review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair and the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier.

- h. To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- i. To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- j. To write an evaluation and recommendation to the department chair of a tenure initiating unit recommending promotion for a joint appointee by the date requested.

5. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

External evaluations are obtained for all promotion and/or tenure reviews. As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. The College of Medicine recommends no more than 25% be suggested by the candidate. The Department of Neuroscience will follow the guidelines of the College of Medicine.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The department will only solicit evaluations from full professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters should be sought as are required, and they should be solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

Any potential reviewer who declines to write a letter of evaluation must be included in the department's report of non-responding evaluators.

Templates for the solicitation of external letters of evaluation for faculty on each in the College of Medicine may be found at:

<http://medicine.osu.edu/faculty/resources/admins/apptoolbox/pages/dossiercontent.aspx>

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

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

C. DOCUMENTATION

Faculty members preparing their dossiers for promotion and/or tenure review should consult [Volume 3](#) of OAA's policies and procedures manual to ensure that all required documentation is included. Additionally, it is highly recommended that faculty members consult the college's Dossier Standardization Guidelines for information about how and where to enter information into the core dossier in alignment with college objectives.

The following paragraphs provide suggested standards for documenting excellence in Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service. Additional standards are included in appendices attached to this document by individual departments, the specific descriptions of initial appointments, and in the outlined criteria for promotion in other sections of this document.

1. TEACHING

Teaching is defined as imparting knowledge, experience, insight, and skill to other persons. In the College of Medicine, teaching must be consistently effective and of high quality.

All Tenure-track must be engaged in teaching, development of the Department's and College's academic programs, and mentoring of students. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated by documentation of teaching activities over a sustained period of time. The College's Office of Medical Education can provide assistance with appropriate documentation and assessment tools to be used in evaluation of teaching.

Evidence for effective teaching may be collected from multiple different sources including students, peers, self-evaluation and administrators. Student evaluations and peer evaluations, at a minimum, are required. Excellence is demonstrated by positive evaluations from students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and national peers. Importantly, administration of an assessment tool must not be under the control of the faculty member being evaluated. Faculty members may supplement the required

assessment tool with others if they wish. Students must be provided an opportunity to assess the instructor and course using the required assessment tool in every classroom course. Guidelines must be established for the frequency with which required assessment tools should be administered in other types of instructional settings such as outpatient clinics, inpatient services, and the operating room. Regardless of the instructional setting, effort should be made to obtain evaluations from the largest number of students possible. When there is a significant discrepancy between the number of students enrolled and the number providing evaluations, the evaluations cannot be assumed to represent a consensus of student opinion.

Typically documentation of teaching for the promotion dossier will include, for the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less:

- cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every formal class
- Med I student evaluations (They don't use MedStar anymore)
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix to this document)
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

2. SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge by research, study and learning. In the College of Medicine, a faculty member's scholarship must be demonstrated to be of high quality, significance and impact.

All tenure-track and research faculty members must develop a record of scholarship that is documented by a body of original scholarly work over a period of time. The evidence for scholarship must refer to original, substantive works that are documented achievements. Recognition of the scholarly work must also be external to the University, residing in the scientific communities apropos to the faculty member's field of scholarship.

Evidence of scholarship can include: peer reviewed journal articles, bulletins and technical reports, original books and monographs, edited books, chapters in edited books, editor reviewed journal articles, reviews and abstracts, papers in proceedings, unpublished scholarly presentations, externally funded research, funded training grants, other funding for academic work, prizes and awards for research or scholarly or creative work, major professional awards and commendations. Evidence of scholarship may also include invited lectures at other universities, symposia, and conferences; invention disclosures,

patent activity, entrepreneurship, technology commercialization, software development; editorship of a major collection of research work; leadership of advanced seminars and symposia under organizational sponsorship; and invitations to serve on national review bodies.

Documentation of scholarship also includes grants and contracts submitted and received, and a demonstration of the impact of the scholarship, as documented with citation data, impact factors, book distribution data or sales figures, adoption of texts or procedures by external departments or academic health centers, and so forth.

3. SERVICE

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. In the College of Medicine, a candidate's service contributions must be demonstrated to be of high quality and effectiveness. All Tenure-track faculty members must contribute to service as evidenced by documentation of contributions over a sustained period of time. In the Department of Neuroscience, we have established a point system that gives variable weight to different service commitments. These points are evaluated by the Chair at his annual review of the faculty.

Evidence of administrative service to the University may include appointment or election to Department, College, and/or University committees, holding administrative positions; development of innovative programs, and participating in mentoring activities. Program Development, reflecting the integration of teaching, service and research in a specific content area, may be given special recognition and significance if desired by the Department. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include editorships of, or service as, a reviewer for journals or other learned publications; offices held and other service to professional societies. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University includes service as a reviewer of grants or other scholarly proposals, external examiner or advisor, a panel and commission participant, and as professional consultant to industry, government, and education.

VIII. APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05. Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

IX. REVIEWS IN THE FINAL YEAR OF PROBATION

In most instances, a decision to deny promotion and tenure in the penultimate probationary year is considered final. However, in rare instances in which there is substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is relevant to the reasons for the original negative decision, a seventh year review may be conducted. The request for this review must come from the eligible faculty and the head of the Department, and may not come from the faculty member

himself/herself. Details of the criteria and procedures for a review in the final year of probation are described in University Rule [3335-6-05](#) (B).

If a terminal year review is conducted by a Department and the College, it will be made consistent with that Department's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, the College's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College, (2) the *Rules of the University Faculty*, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, including the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high to distribute the form. The faculty member should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members. Peer evaluations may include internal, and/or external review of classroom instruction, clinical teaching and course materials such as syllabi, examinations and instructional materials including textbooks. Assessment by observation of classroom and clinical teaching is most useful when done systematically over time and conducted with the specific goal of offering constructive suggestions.

In the Department of Neuroscience, each faculty member has a mentoring committee consisting of 2-3 members. One of their responsibilities is to attend lectures of their mentees and to provide peer evaluations of teaching. Faculty who serve as course directors also are asked to provide a written evaluation of junior faculty.

Other documentation of teaching may include an administrator's assessment of the candidate's teaching load, contribution to the teaching mission of the academic unit, and contribution to curriculum development. Evidence of the success of the candidate's former students including professional and graduate students and post-doctoral trainees should be documented.

XII. APPENDIX

AAUP STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.
3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

The statement above was originally adopted in 1966. Revisions were made and approved by the Association's Council in 1987 and 2009.

S/NS/Admn/Neuro AP & T Guidelines2005
Revised 05/02/05
Approved by OAA 5/16/05

Revised per OAA 09/14/07

Revised 11/10/10

Revised 4/30/11

Revised 9/6/11

Revised 5/30/12

Revised 9/6/13