

**APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
FOR AND ASSOCIATED FACULTY**

**SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION SCIENCES
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

Approved as Revised 02/01/2013
Revised per OAA 09/28/2013

Table of Contents

I.	Preamble.....	5
II.	School Mission.....	6
III.	Definitions	7
A.	Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	7
1.	Tenure-track Faculty	7
2.	Clinical Faculty	8
3.	Research Faculty	8
4.	Conflict of Interest	8
5.	Minimum Composition.....	8
6.	Quorum	8
B.	Recommendations from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	8
1.	Appointment.....	9
2.	Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal	9
IV.	Appointments	9
A.	Criteria.....	9
1.	Tenure-track Faculty	9
2.	Tenure-track Faculty at Regional Campus.....	12
3.	Clinical Faculty	12
4.	Research Faculty	14
5.	Associated Faculty	15
6.	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	17
B.	Procedures.....	18
1.	Tenure-track Faculty	18
2.	Clinical Faculty	20
3.	Research Faculty	20
4.	Associated Faculty	20
5.	Committee of the Eligible Faculty Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	21
V.	Annual Review Procedures.....	21
A.	Probationary Tenure-track Faculty.....	22
1.	Faculty at a Regional Campus	24
2.	Fourth-Year Review	24
3.	Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period.....	25

B.	Tenured Faculty	26
1.	Procedures for the Annual Review of Tenured Faculty NOT Seeking Promotion in the Following Year	26
2.	Procedures for the Annual Review of Tenured Faculty Seeking Promotion in the Current Cycle	26
C.	Tenured Faculty at a Regional Campus.....	27
D.	Clinical Faculty	28
1.	Procedures for the Annual Review of Clinical Faculty during the Probationary Period.....	28
2.	Procedures for the Annual Review of Clinical Faculty who are Not Seeking Promotion and who are Not Under the Probationary Period.....	28
3.	Procedures for the Annual Review of Clinical Faculty Being Considered for Promotion or for Reappointment	29
E.	Research Faculty	30
1.	Procedures for the Annual Review of Research Faculty during the Probationary Period	30
2.	Procedures for the Annual Review of Research Faculty who are Not Seeking Promotion and who are Not Under the Probationary Period.....	31
3.	Procedures for the Annual Review of Research Faculty Being Considered for Promotion or Reappointment	32
VI.	Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	33
A.	Criteria.....	33
B.	Procedures.....	33
C.	Documentation	33
VII.	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	34
A.	Criteria.....	34
1.	Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.....	34
2.	Promotion to Professor	38
3.	Promotion of Clinical Faculty.....	41
4.	Promotion of Research Faculty	48
B.	Procedures.....	49
1.	Tenure-track Faculty	49
2.	Clinical Faculty	53
3.	Research Faculty	56
4.	Associated Faculty	58

C.	Documentation	59
1.	Teaching Evaluation.....	60
2.	External Evaluation of Teaching	62
3.	Research/Scholarship	62
4.	Service	63
VIII.	Appeals	63
IX.	Seventh-Year Review	64
X.	Appendices	65
A.	Sample Letter Directed to an External Evaluator	65

<i>Table 1: Representative Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor, Tenure-track, With Tenure.</i>	<i>37</i>
---	-----------

<i>Table 2: Representative Evidence for Promotion to the Rank of Professor with Tenure.....</i>	<i>39</i>
---	-----------

<i>Table 3: Representative Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor, Clinical.....</i>	<i>44</i>
---	-----------

<i>Table 4: Representative Evidence for Promotion to Professor Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences</i>	<i>46</i>
--	-----------

I. Preamble

This document describes the criteria and procedures regarding appointment, promotion and tenure for faculty in the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences in the College of Medicine of The Ohio State University. It is a supplement to the Rules of the University Faculty, the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the college and university.

The Ohio State University Board of Trustees
Rules of the University Faculty as of June 18, 2010
<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>

In particular Chapter 3335-6 describes the rules for promotion and tenure considerations for tenure-track faculty, and Chapter 3335-7 describes the rules for tenure and promotion of clinical and research faculty. Guidance for faculty and access to additional rules, policies and procedures for appointments and promotion of faculty is provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty candidates applying for promotion and tenure, faculty members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty of the school, and administrators participating in the process are each responsible for familiarizing themselves with and following those rules and policies. Should those rules and policies change, the school 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 school director.

In some cases, faculty rules are directly quoted in this document. In other cases the rules is summarized. A link to the relevant rule is also provided; in case of a discrepancy the current university rule is applied.

This document has been approved by the Dean of the College of Medicine and the Executive and Vice President and Provost of The Ohio State University. It sets forth the school's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, promotion, tenure, and rewards, including salary increases. In the remainder of this document, the officials above are referred to informally as the college and the university.

Promotion to a higher academic rank and the granting of tenure are two ways in which the university recognizes the merit of outstanding contributions made by a faculty member. Promotion and tenure are based solely on merit. Each faculty member should be systematically involved in the promotion and tenure process from the first day of his/her appointment in the school, and this involvement needs to continue after promotion to a new level. Faculty members need to make themselves aware of the standards by which their performance will be evaluated and the evaluation processes in which they will be involved. Decisions about work priorities and time allocation to teaching, research and other scholarly activity, and service, should be consciously made, with the counsel of the school director.

Within the context of its mission, the school sets the goal of continuously improving the quality of its endeavors. The school, additionally, assures that its policy on “Faculty Duties and Responsibilities,” included in its “Pattern of Administration,” is consistent with the mission and its criteria for appointment, promotion, tenure, merit salary increases, and other rewards.

When Faculty Rules are cited, the quotations have been modified using “school” in place of “tenure initiating unit.”

II. School Mission

VISION STATEMENT

The School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences will be nationally acknowledged as among the finest and most distinguished for its excellence in education, research, and service

MISSION STATEMENT

To improve the lives of people and create the future of the health professions through innovation, education, and service.

As stated above, the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences has as its central mission the education of students for excellence in health care services. Towards this endeavor, the school maintains an environment in which research and scholarly activity inspire and inform teaching. Curricula are structured to foster learning, nurture individual growth and creativity, and support the goals of professional health care practice, administration, teaching, and research, at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Individual differences in learners are valued as the faculty promotes scholarship in all who study under their guidance.

Fundamental to the school's mission is to also engage in research and other scholarly activity that enhances the knowledge base of the allied health professions. This knowledge base forms a vital link in the improvement of human health, and keeps the school at the forefront of innovation in education and research in the health professions. In addition, students must be prepared to interpret these ideas and innovations so as to make them accessible to the citizens of the state of Ohio and the world. In keeping with the land-grant heritage of The Ohio State University, the school's mission, additionally, includes service to the professions, the university, and the community.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The Committee of the Eligible Faculty comprises all of the School's eligible faculty and is a standing committee of the school. It is charged with providing the school director with significant consultative input concerning the promotion and tenure of current school faculty, review and recommendations for and associated faculty appointments, and the annual review of non-tenured faculty members. The committee also promotes awareness of promotion and tenure procedures and standards among school faculty, especially junior faculty, and offers counsel on such matters as requested.

There is not a separate subset of eligible members in the school assigned to an advisory P&T committee, as outlined in section 2.4.2 of the OAA guideline.

The chair of the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall be a tenured faculty member recommended by the members of the committee and appointed through by the director of the school. The chair of the committee serves a two-year term. In the second year, a chair-elect is selected, whose term begins July 1st.

Decisions made by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty with regards to appointments, evaluation of probationary faculty, and promotions can only be made by those faculty members eligible to consider the matter for the based on the candidate's and rank.

The concept of eligible faculty is three fold. First, only faculty at the rank of associate professor or above sit on the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Only nonprobationary clinical faculty and nonprobationary research faculty are members of the eligible faculty.

Second, an individual faculty member can only evaluate those at or below rank. And third, faculty responsibilities are determined by their track: Tenured faculty members review faculty in any track, clinical faculty review those in the clinical or research tracks, and research faculty can only review those in the research. Faculty Rules exclude the school director from being a voting member of the committee. In the case of a new appointment to the faculty, a special exception applies, as outlined in section 2.4.1 of the OAA guidelines (Vol. I, pg. 23):

“For faculty recommendations on initial appointment, the committee of the eligible faculty includes assistant professors. A second vote is taken when an appointment at senior rank of the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank is under consideration.”

1. Tenure-track Faculty

When the faculty member being reviewed has an appointment on the tenure-track, only tenured faculty at or above the rank sought for appointment or promotion are eligible. For example, for a faculty member seeking promotion to full professor from associate professor, only the full professors in the school are eligible.

2. Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are eligible only for decisions pertaining to clinical or research faculty. Faculty in the clinical may not participate in promotion and tenure reviews of faculty in the tenure-track.

3. Research Faculty

Research faculty are eligible only for decisions pertaining to research faculty. Faculty in the research may not participate in promotion and tenure reviews of faculty in the tenure-track or in the clinical .

4. Conflict of Interest

Members of the eligible faculty with a conflict of interest must recuse themselves from the review process. Faculty with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate must not participate in a review of that candidate. In addition, a close professional relationship may give rise to a conflict of interest, such as when a faculty member is co-author on a significant portion of the candidate's publications, has served as the candidate's dissertation advisor, or is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional activities.

5. Minimum Composition

A minimum of three faculty members must be involved in any vote for the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. In the event the school does not have three eligible faculty members who can undertake the review, the school director, after consulting the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another TIU within the college.

6. Quorum

All meetings of the eligible faculty must be face-to-face. The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds 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.

B. Recommendations 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 two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

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

IV. Appointments

The school has tenure, clinical and research faculty, as well as associated faculty and courtesy appointments.

All new senior faculty appointments (associate or full professor) of any kind (tenure, clinical or research, associated, or courtesy) require approval of the college and university. New senior appointments of faculty require an external review of the candidate.

A. Criteria

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, as part of a distinguished comprehensive medical center and university, is committed to the appointment of tenure-track faculty who will make significant contributions to the body of knowledge in their field of health, rehabilitation science, and education, through research and other scholarly activities. The individual appointed must also strive to bring the most current information into the classroom and be dedicated to the teaching-learning process. In addition, the faculty member will be expected to provide professional, university, and community service. The whole of achievement for the school is only as great as the sum of its parts. Therefore, recognition of the potential contribution of each faculty member in moving the school forward is the basis for each appointment.

a. Criteria for Tenure-track Faculty Appointments According to Rank

(1) Appointments at the Rank of Instructor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 states:

“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, his or her time as an instructor is not counted toward tenure. The faculty member can request that time as an instructor count toward tenure. This request must be approved by the Chair, Dean and Provost. This written request must be forwarded to the office of academic affairs through the dean of the college so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.”

Appointment to the rank of instructor may be made when the candidate meets all criteria for appointment to the rank of assistant professor but has not completed the appropriate terminal degree. The candidate shall have attained candidacy status in a terminal degree program and be making sufficient progress in his/her degree program with the expectation that it can be completed within a maximum of two years from the date of appointment.

Appointment to the rank of instructor may also be made for candidates who have a terminal degree but who do not have the requisite skills and experience to assume the full range of responsibilities of an assistant professor. Candidates for appointment at rank of instructor should demonstrate potential for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service and should be judged to have strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks.

Faculty who were hired into the tenure-track at the rank of Instructor must document the following minimum criteria for promotion to assistant professor as a pre-requisite to consideration for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or equivalent.
- Initial evidence of quality teaching including evidence of strong written and oral communication skills.
- Initial evidence of focused, high quality scholarship, research and/or creative work.
- Evidence of active service to the division, school, college, university or profession.

When an individual is appointed as an instructor using either option above, the letter of offer should delineate specific expectations and benchmarks for performance consistent with the criteria for promotion to assistant professor in Section VII.A.1 of this document. As with all faculty hires, individuals hired at the rank of instructor should demonstrate strong potential to advance through the faculty ranks.

(2) Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor

Faculty who were hired into the regular tenure track at the rank of Instructor must document the following minimum criteria for promotion to assistant professor as a pre-requisite to consideration for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or equivalent.
- Initial evidence of quality teaching including evidence of strong written and oral communication skills.
- Initial evidence of focused, high quality scholarship, research and/or creative work.

- Evidence of active service to the division, school, college, university or profession.

(3) Appointments at the Rank of Assistant Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 states:

“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.”

A faculty candidate may be appointed at the rank of assistant professor in the school if he/she fulfills the above general requirements for appointments, and fulfills the school’s criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VII.A.1. of this document.

(4) Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor

(a) *Associate Professor with Tenure*

A faculty candidate may be appointed at the rank of associate professor in the school if he/she fulfills the above general requirements for appointments, and fulfills the school’s criteria for promotion to this rank. Candidates for appointment at the rank of associate professor should demonstrate evidence of impact and recognition at the national level. Appointments at the rank of associate professor generally include the award of tenure and require the approval of the college and university.

(b) *Associate Professor without Tenure*

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 states:

“An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the school and the college. For the petition to be approved a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments at the rank of professor require prior approval of the college and university.”

(5) Appointments at the Rank of Professor

A faculty candidate may be appointed to the rank of professor in the school if he/she fulfills the above general requirements for appointments and fulfills the school’s criteria for promotion to this rank. A candidate for appointment at the rank of professor should demonstrate evidence of impact and recognition in his/her area of expertise through national leadership roles and international recognition. Appointments at the rank of professor generally include the award of tenure and require the approval of the college and university.

2. Tenure-track Faculty at Regional Campus

The school does not offer programs and will make no new faculty appointments at any of the regional campuses.

3. Clinical Faculty

The university's criteria for appointments, for reappointment and non-reappointment, and for promotion for faculty in the clinical track are found in Faculty Rule [3335-7-05](#).

All faculty in the school, including clinical faculty, are expected to contribute to all aspects of the school's academic mission, teaching, research, and service. Faculty appointed to the clinical will include those individuals who are, or are expected to be deployed primarily in clinically-related teaching and service responsibilities including, but not limited to, undergraduate and/or graduate teaching, advisement and student mentoring, clinical teaching, continuing professional and peer education, curriculum and course development, application of creative instructional strategies and other learning enhancements, recruitment, and honors advisement. The individual appointed must have the appropriate clinical credentials as may be required for their profession; advanced or specialist certification will be highly valued. Faculty in the clinical track must strive to bring the most current information into the clinical classroom and be dedicated to the teaching-learning process. This should be reflected by excellence in teaching ratings and development or enhancement of high quality clinical programs.

The School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, as part of a distinguished comprehensive medical center and university, is committed to the appointment of clinical faculty who in addition to their clinical teaching responsibilities, will make significant contributions to the body of knowledge in their field of allied health, science, and education, through research and other scholarly activities. As described in the criteria for promotion, the distinction between tenure-track and clinical faculty in the realm of research and scholarship is as follows. While tenure-track will be expected to lead an independent program of research and scholarship, clinical faculty will be expected to *contribute to* the research and scholarly productivity of the school through supporting and collaborative roles.

Clinical faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in service to the school, the college, the university, the community and their profession. This may also include excellence in clinical service for faculty with a defined clinical role.

For all ranks in the clinical track, including senior appointments, the initial appointment is probationary, requiring annual review of progress as described in Section V.D. Renewal of a clinical appointment is not guaranteed, even if the performance of the faculty member meets or exceeds the requirements. If renewal is approved, then a 3 – 5 year non-probationary contract is offered.

a. Specific Criteria for Clinical Faculty Appointments According to Rank

(1) Appointments at the Rank of Instructor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

Appointment as Instructor on the Clinical track is for persons with doctoral degree (or equivalent terminal degree) and/or appropriate clinical credentials pending, who have the relevant clinical expertise, and who are expected to be primarily engaged in clinically-related teaching and service, while making contributions to scholarship and academic service. The initial appointment for an instructor is probationary for a three year term. Individuals appointed in this rank will be eligible for mid-contract promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences upon completion of the academic requirements (doctoral degree or clinical credentials) and contingent upon satisfactory progress as a faculty member during the term as instructor. The appointment at the instructor rank is not renewable after this three year term.

(2) Appointments at the Rank of Assistant Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

Appointment as Assistant Professor, Clinical is for persons who have an earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree, the relevant clinical expertise, and who are expected to be involved in clinically-related teaching and service, while making contributions to scholarship and service. The initial probationary appointment as an Assistant Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences is for a 3-5 year term, and renewal appointments are for 3 to 5-year terms.

Candidates for appointment as Assistant Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences will have, at a minimum:

- A record of excellence or evidence of potential for excellence in teaching
- A record of or potential to perform effective service
- Previous experience or potential for contributing to research and scholarly productivity
- Potential to advance through faculty ranks

(3) Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation sciences

- Appointment as Associate Professor, Clinical, is for persons who have provided clear and convincing evidence of a demonstrated record of national impact and recognition and have at a minimum:
- Exceeded the school criteria for appointment as an Assistant Professor, Clinical
- Met or exceeded the school criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, Clinical

The initial probationary appointment as an Associate Professor, Clinical, is for a four-year term, and renewal appointments are for three to five-year terms.

(4) Appointments at the Rank of Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences Appointment as Professor, Clinical, is for persons who have provided clear and convincing evidence of a sustained record of national impact and recognition, national leadership roles and international recognition, and have at a minimum:

- Exceeded the school criteria for appointment as an Associate Professor, Clinical, and
- Met or exceeded the school criteria for promotion to Professor, Clinical

The initial probationary appointment as a Professor, Clinical is for a four-year term, and renewal appointments are for three to five-year terms.

4. Research Faculty

The Research track exists for faculty members who focus primarily on scholarship. A Research faculty member may, but is not required to, participate in educational and service activities. According to faculty rule 3335-7-34

“The primary duty of research faculty is to conduct research. A research faculty member may, but is not required to, participate in limited educational activities in the area of his or her expertise. However, teaching opportunities for each research faculty member must be approved by a majority vote of the TIU’s tenured faculty. Under no circumstances may a member of the research faculty be continuously engaged over an extended period in the same instructional activities as tenure- faculty. An appointment to a research faculty position should not be made to displace or make unnecessary an appointment to a tenure- faculty position.”

The time allowable for activities not focused on research may depend on the nature and source of funding. The standards for scholarly achievement are similar to those for individuals on the Tenure-track for each faculty rank. Research faculty members are expected to contribute to the school’s research mission and are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected by high quality peer-reviewed publications and successful attainment of nationally competitive peer-reviewed funding.

Appointments to the Research Track are made in accordance with the *University Faculty Rules* 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in a department, Research faculty must comprise no more than twenty per cent of the number of tenure-track faculty in the department. In all cases, however, the number of Research faculty positions in a unit must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in the Department.

Contracts will be for a period of at least one year and for no more than five years, and must explicitly state the expectations for the level of salary support to be derived from extramural funds. The initial contract is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be reappointed for the following 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 extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract

period. In the event that a new contract is not extended, 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.

Research faculty members are eligible to serve on departmental and university committees and task forces but not on university governance committees. Research faculty members also are 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 detailed in Section IX the Graduate School Handbook.

a. Specific Criteria for Research Faculty Appointments According to Rank

(1) Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor on the Research Track

The requirements for appointment as a Research Assistant Professor include that the candidate has provided clear and convincing evidence of impact and recognition at local or regional level, and has, at a minimum:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or possession of equivalent experience.
- Completion of sufficient post-doctoral research training to provide the basis for establishment of an independent research program.
- An initial record of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by having begun to develop a body of research, scholarship, and creative work, and initial evidence of program of research as reflected by first or senior author publications or multiple co-authorships and existing or strong likelihood of extramural research funding as one of several program directors or principal investigators on network-type or center grants (multiple-PD/PI) or as a co-investigator on multiple grants.
- A mindset and record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors. Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

(2) Appointment at the Rank of Associate Professor on the Research

The criteria for initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor in the Research Track are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in [Section VII.A.5](#) of this document.

(3) Appointment at the Rank of Professor on the Research Track

The criteria for initial appointment to the rank of Professor in the Research Track are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in [Section VII.A.5](#) of this document.

5. Associated Faculty

Rules for Associated Faculty can be found in the general definitions of under Faculty Rule 3335-5-19, item (D). Titles appropriate to these appointments can be found in on the OAA Handbook at the following location:

<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/FacultyRankTitleCode.pdf>

a. *Roles of Associated Faculty in the School*

The associated faculty is comprised of all persons with an adjunct title (i.e., Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Instructor); clinical title; visiting title; lecturers; faculty with less than 50% appointments at the university. Members of the associated faculty provide vital contributions to the school, but their responsibilities to the academic units are not as extensive as those of the faculty. Appointees to the associated faculty may be accorded some faculty privileges, but do not accrue or hold tenure. Associated faculty may be salaried or non-salaried positions. Associated faculty appointments are for 1 to 3 years and can be renewed.

Associated faculty may teach in either in the classroom setting or provide supervision during practica or fieldwork. In the school, a "clinical" title is given to those individuals teaching primarily in a patient care setting or service setting, while an "adjunct" or lecturer title is given to individuals teaching primarily in a non-patient setting. In general, the clinical or adjunct rank parallels the rank which would be appropriate if the individual were a member of the faculty and similar criteria are used when appointment or promotion is considered.

b. *Specific Criteria for Associated Faculty Appointments According to Rank*

The following are criteria for appointment, requisites, and capacities of the clinical and adjunct faculty in the school:

(1) Appointments at the Rank of Clinical or Adjunct Instructor

- Appointment as Instructor on the Clinical track is for persons with a terminal degree in their field, certification, registration and/or licensure in a professional area where appropriate; and a minimum of two years' experience in professional practice. They are expected to be primarily engaged in clinically-related teaching, precepting, student supervision, and service;
- Maintains high standards of professional performance and practice as a patient care or practitioner and/or educator; demonstrates participation in scholarly activities; and serves as a role model for students.
- Demonstrates ability to teach students effectively prior to appointment; at least one semester of teaching experience for the school or contributes actively to clinical educational programs of the school, such as supervision of students, curriculum planning/development, team teaching, membership on divisional committees, or recruitment.

(2) Appointments at the Rank of Clinical or Adjunct Assistant Professor

- A doctoral degree or equivalent qualifications
- Meets or exceeds criteria for rank of Clinical or Adjunct Instructor

(3) Appointments at the Rank of Clinical or Adjunct Associate Professor

- A doctoral degree or equivalent qualifications
- Meets or exceeds criteria for rank of Clinical or Adjunct Assistant Professor
- Contributes to the formal academic program in the school with responsibilities for didactic information in a specialty area. Is recognized as an outstanding teacher, as evidenced by evaluation by peers and students.
- Conducts and/or participates in research activities related to the professional area.
- Publishes in professional journals, books, and monographs.

(4) Appointments at the Rank of Clinical or Adjunct Professor

- A doctoral degree or equivalent qualifications
- Meets or exceeds criteria for rank of Clinical or Adjunct Associate Professor
- Recognized national authority in an area of professional practice
- Nationally recognized for contributions to the profession
- Conducts and directs research activities related to the professional area

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associate appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Courtesy appointments (non-salaried, joint appointments) in the school are made for faculty members with primary appointments in other departments or colleges at The Ohio State University, who teach students, perform collaborative research with faculty whose primary appointment is in the school, or contribute administrative or other expertise which is beneficial to the school. The rank of the courtesy appointment in the school must be consistent with the rank of the primary appointment. To qualify for the courtesy appointment, the candidate must fulfill the criteria of the school for appointment to the proposed rank. The primary tenure initiating unit (TIU) is responsible for the professional development and evaluation of the faculty member.

B. Procedures

1. Tenure-track Faculty

a. Initial Appointment

(1) National Search

Candidates for a faculty appointment assigned to a division are identified by a search committee made up of faculty who are appointed by the respective division director. Candidates for a division director position or for faculty with school-wide duties are identified by a search committee appointed by the school director. Each search is conducted nationally in accordance with the rules of The Ohio State University. Vigorous efforts are made to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. A member of the search committee is specifically identified as the diversity advocate. The Office of Human Resources publishes guidelines for effective searches (<http://hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>).

At the conclusion of a search, the chair of the committee reports its recommendation(s) to the division director, or to the school director in the case of division directors or school-wide faculty. Requests for appointments based on a search within a division are submitted by the division director to the school director.

This national search requirement applies at the time of initial appointment, which may result in an appointment at the rank of instructor. In this case, the national search criterion has been satisfied and a new search is not required at the time of promotion to assistant professor.

(2) Application Requirements

Candidates for appointment at the rank of instructor or assistant professor must submit a current CV along with other supporting documentation providing clear evidence of the candidate's potential for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. This should reflect the candidate's potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks. A full dossier is not required, but if available, it will facilitate the review process.

Candidates for appointments at the rank of associate or full professor may submit a full dossier or equivalent documentation providing clear evidence of the candidate's excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Senior appointments also require external letters of evaluation which are solicited by the division or school director. The process for soliciting these letters must follow the OAA Guidelines for letters of evaluation using the sample provided in Appendix B of this document, paralleling the procedures for outside evaluation for promotion with tenure.

Applications from candidates who will be serving as faculty in a division should include an evaluation from the director of that division, paralleling the evaluation that would be provided a candidate for promotion. If the appointment is for a division director or faculty not in a division, then a member of the school's executive committee selected by the executive committee shall serve this role in accordance with the procedure for promotion of division directors.

(3) Procedure for Appointment

The school director submits requests for appointments along of all faculty to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty of the school for review, evaluation, and recommendation. An individual cover letter is submitted for each request, delineating the requested faculty rank and the nature of the teaching, research, and service activities in the school. Requests must be accompanied by supporting documents as specified above to ensure compliance with the criteria for the rank sought.

The meeting of the eligible faculty shall commence with presentation of the candidate's qualifications by the division director requesting the appointment or the alternate from the executive committee in case the candidate is to be appointed as a division director or other position reporting directly to the school director.

Following this presentation the candidate's accomplishments are reviewed by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The division director or alternate shall be present and available to correct any discrepancies in Committee of the Eligible Faculty's assessment of the candidate's accomplishments. The division director or alternate shall then be excused from further deliberations.

Discussion of the candidate shall follow, and then the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall vote. The recommendation of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty regarding each request is forwarded in writing by the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to the school director. The school director seeks approval from the college and, for faculty appointed to a division, informs the division director of the final action.

If the appointment is approved, a letter of offer of employment, signed by the division director (for faculty appointed to a division) and the school director, is sent to the candidate by the division director or school director. This letter of offer must be consistent with the university's Guidelines for Faculty Position Letters of Offer.

All offers at the rank of associated professor and professor, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit, require the approval of the college and university. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

b. Transfer from the Tenure-track

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

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

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

2. Clinical Faculty

The same procedures described above for tenure-track faculty are followed for clinical faculty, with two exceptions. First, the criteria for appointment evaluated by the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty are found in the section on clinical faculty, in VII.A.4. Exceptions to a national search only requires approval by the college dean.

3. Research Faculty

Searches for initial appointments in the Research should follow the same procedures as those utilized by the school for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that demonstrated experience or potential for excellence in teaching is not an expectation. 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 requested in advance from the Dean of the College of Medicine. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in *A Guide to Effective Searches*, found at: <http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty are recruited by the faculty in a division or program. Candidates submit their credentials to the division or program director who, in turn, writes a letter to the school director requesting the appointment and indicating the desired rank and expected role to be filled by the associated faculty member. The request must be accompanied by a curriculum vita.

Appointments at these ranks are based on the expectation of a substantial contribution to the school.

a. AP&T Review of Associated Faculty Appointments

All initial associated faculty appointments must be forwarded by the school director to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for review, evaluation, and recommendation. Consideration of these appointments by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty does not require a face to face meeting. Committee of the Eligible Faculty members shall individually evaluate the supporting documentation in electronic or other formats and shall independently vote by email or in person to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty chair.

Associated faculty appointments are for 1 to 3 years. Subsequent appointments of a given individual at the same rank do not require review by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

b. School Action on Associated Faculty Appointments

Based on the vote of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty sends a written recommendation to the school director. New associated faculty

appointments must be submitted to the college for approval. Senior appointments (associate or full professor) require approval from the college and university. The school director seeks approval from above and informs the division director (for faculty in a division) of the final decision. The division or school director then informs the candidate who, in turn, submits the necessary personnel forms to the division or school director. The division or school director forwards the paperwork to the school's human resource officer for processing.

In years after the initial associated faculty appointment, the decision to reappoint at the same rank is made at the administrative level and does require approval of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

5. Committee of the Eligible Faculty Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

a. Initiation of Courtesy Faculty Appointments

Faculty in other university departments who make a substantial contribution to the school may be offered a non-salaried courtesy appointment in the school. If the courtesy appointment is specific to a division or program, then the request must come from the division or program director. If the candidate accepts the nomination, the candidate submits his/her credentials, and the division or program director provides a written nomination to the school director requesting the appointment and indicating the faculty rank and the expected role to be filled by the faculty member. The request must be accompanied by a curriculum vita. The school director forwards the request to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for review and evaluation.

b. AP&T Review of Courtesy Faculty Appointments

The procedures for review of courtesy faculty appointments follow those for associated faculty appointments.

The chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty sends a written recommendation to the school director. The school director informs the division or program director of his/her final decision. The division or program director informs the candidate who, in turn, submits the necessary personnel forms to the school's human resource officer for processing. These appointments do not require prior approval by the college. The school director, in consultation with a division director or program director as indicated, may terminate a courtesy appointment when, in his/her judgment, a faculty member no longer makes a substantial contribution to the school.

V. Annual Review Procedures

All units within the College of Medicine are required to conduct an annual review of all faculty. School procedures are consistent with those of the College of Medicine guidelines and include the following for all tenure-track, research and clinical faculty members:

- Annual reviews are the responsibility of the school director.
- Annual reviews will be based on the previous calendar year.

- An abbreviated initial review of first year faculty for purposes of merit is conducted in May of the first year and considers performance since date of hire. See the merit review section.
- Current faculty curriculum vitae are to be maintained in an accessible location in the school where any faculty members can review them.
- A face-to-face meeting is required annually between the school director and each faculty member. The division director also participates in this meeting.
- The review culminates in a letter or other written report by the school director that must include:
 - A summary of the strengths and weaknesses in the faculty member's performance.
 - For probationary faculty, a decision to reappoint a faculty member to another probationary year or to terminate the probationary appointment subject to relevant standards of notice (see Faculty Rule 3335-6-08).
 - Advice for improvement and discussion of goals for the future and expectations and plans for professional development.
 - A statement informing the faculty member of the right to review his/her primary personnel file and to include a written comment on any material in the file.
- The annual review should be aimed at the following objectives:
 - Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the creation of professional development plans.
 - Establish the goals against which faculty performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future.
 - Document faculty performance in order to determine salary increases and other resources allocations, progress toward promotion, and in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 section (C) covers the rules for annual review of tenure-track faculty during the probationary period, including the fourth year review. The following key points are restated from that rule with text appropriate to the school and this document.

“(1) At the time of appointment, probationary tenure- faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing school, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary tenure- faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.”

(2) During a probationary period a tenure- faculty member shall be reviewed annually in accordance with this rule and with policies of the school, college and university. The annual review shall follow the procedures set forth above under Section IV of this document. The school director 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.

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 section V.A.2.) and the dean shall make the final decision in the matter.

All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

(3) When probationary tenure- faculty receive their annual review, the school director shall inform them of their right to review their primary personnel file maintained by the school and to place in that file a response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file (see rule 3335-3-35 of the Administrative Code).

In the school, in addition to the general procedures stated immediately under Section V for all faculty, the following guidance is provided to probationary tenure-track faculty

When does the review take place?

Autumn Semester, unless it is the first year of appointment in which the review takes place in Spring Semester.

What time period is being reviewed?

Previous academic year – autumn through summer semester of the previous year. In first year of appointment, time since hire is considered.

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

Full dossier consisting of productivity from date of hire and using the OAA core of the dossier outline. A *Research in View* version of the core dossier must be submitted. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on the first day of business on or after September 1.

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

Committee of the Eligible Faculty reviews record, meets with division director, and develops a summary evaluation based on the AP&T criteria document of the school and forwards the summary to the school director.

What school director action is required?

As specified under Section IV above, the school director reviews materials, prepares a summary evaluation, meets with the faculty member (along with the division director for faculty in a division) and writes a detailed letter of evaluation, which is sent to the faculty member being reviewed by February 15. In the event of a negative review and a recommendation for non-renewal, the fourth year review process must be followed.

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for tenure and/or promotion.

1. Faculty at a Regional Campus

The school does not have programs or probationary faculty at any regional campus.

2. Fourth-Year Review

The fourth year review of probationary tenure-track faculty shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion at school and college levels, with two exceptions: external letters are not solicited for the fourth year review, and the process at the level of the college dean is somewhat different, as described below.

The procedure for tenure and promotion for tenure-track faculty is specified in Section VII.B.1. of this document. All procedures outlined in this section apply for the fourth year review. As noted above, the only difference at the school level is that external evaluations are not solicited or included in the dossier for the fourth year review.

The original letter of assessment prepared by the division director on behalf of faculty in that division, or alternate member from the executive committee for division directors and others who report directly to the school director, is due along with the candidate's dossier by close of business on September 1.

The Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall complete its review as specified in VII.B.1 by October 31.

The school director shall complete the assessment as specified in VII.B.1 by November 15. The formal comments process specified under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 is followed as in the mandatory review year. After the comments process, the dossier is then sent directly to the college dean for consideration.

Upon a positive recommendation from the school, renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires only the approval of the dean of the college and does not require review by the college's Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the school's recommendation, the college dean must consult with the college Committee of the Eligible Faculty. In the case of a negative decision, the dossier is submitted to the university AP& T Committee for further review.

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, a positive decision results in renewal of the faculty member's appointment for another year, whereas a negative decision for the fourth year review results in termination of the appointment at the end of the fifth year.

3. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, section (D)

(1) A probationary tenure-track faculty member 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. The school director 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 her/his school director, college 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 (see paragraph (D)(2) of this rule). The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period per birth event or adoption of children under age six is one year.

(2) A probationary tenure-track faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful university faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, or service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted in writing to the school director. Requests shall be reviewed by the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty which shall advise the school director regarding their appropriateness. Such requests require approval by the school director, college 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.

(3) 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.

(4) 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, assistant professor or associate professor. Exceptions require the approval of the school director, college dean, and executive vice president and provost.

(5) Tenure-track 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.

(6) 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.

B. Tenured Faculty

1. Procedures for the Annual Review of Tenured Faculty NOT Seeking Promotion in the Following Year

When does the review take place?

Spring Semester

What time period is being reviewed?

The year since the previous annual evaluation.

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

Abbreviated dossier consisting of productivity from the preceding year using *Research in View*. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on March 15

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

None

What school director action is required?

The school director reviews materials and prepares a summary evaluation. A face-to-face meeting with the faculty member along with the division director is required

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for tenure and/or promotion.

2. Procedures for the Annual Review of Tenured Faculty Seeking Promotion in the Current Cycle

When does the review take place?

Autumn Semester

What time period is being reviewed?

All years since the year tenured or the year of last promotion

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

Full dossier consisting of productivity from date of hire and using the OAA core of the dossier outline. External letters are required. The Research in View version of the core dossier must be submitted. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on the first business day on or after September 1.

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

Committee of the Eligible Faculty of eligible members (of higher rank than the candidate) reviews the dossier, meets with division director, develops a summary evaluation based on the AP&T criteria document of the school, and votes on the candidate. The summary of the AP&T assessment and numerical vote shall be forwarded to the school director.

What division director action is required?

The division director (or alternate from the executive committee for division directors) reviews the candidate's record, develops a summary, and forwards the record and summary to the school director.

What school director action is required?

The school director reviews materials and prepares a written evaluation and recommendation, meets face-to-face with the candidate, and sends the letter and dossier to the college for a decision. The faculty member shall be notified of his/her right to respond to the evaluation by placing comments in the dossier.

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for tenure and/or promotion.

C. Tenured Faculty at a Regional Campus

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

D. Clinical Faculty

1. Procedures for the Annual Review of Clinical Faculty during the Probationary Period

When does the review take place?

Autumn Semester; in the first year of appointment, the review is in Spring semester.

What time period is being reviewed?

Previous contract year; or in the first year of appointment time since hire.

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

The Research in View version of the core dossier must be submitted. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on the first day of business on or after September 1

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

Committee of the Eligible Faculty reviews the dossier, meets with division director, and develops a summary evaluation based on the AP&T criteria document of the school. The summary of the AP&T assessment shall be forwarded to the school director.

What division director action is required?

The division director (or alternate from the executive committee for division directors) reviews the candidate's record, develops a summary, and forwards the record and summary to the school director.

What school director action is required?

The school director reviews materials, meets with the faculty member, and prepares a written evaluation. The faculty member shall be notified of his/her right to respond to the evaluation by placing comments in the dossier.

In the event of a negative review and a decision for non-renewal during the probationary period the faculty member must be notified by February 15.

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for reappointment and/or promotion.

2. Procedures for the Annual Review of Clinical Faculty who are Not Seeking Promotion and who are Not Under the Probationary Period

When does the review take place?

Spring Semester

What time period is being reviewed?

Year since last review

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

Abbreviated dossier consisting of the past year's productivity using Research in View. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on March 15

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

None

What division director action is required?

The division director (or alternate member of the executive committee for candidates who are division director s) reviews the candidate's record, develops a summary, and forwards the record and summary to the school director.

What school director action is required?

The school director reviews materials. The school director prepares a written evaluation (after the meeting, if one occurred). The faculty member shall be notified of his/her right to respond to the evaluation by placing comments in the dossier.

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for reappointment and/or promotion.

3. Procedures for the Annual Review of Clinical Faculty Being Considered for Promotion or for Reappointment

When does the review take place?

Autumn Semester

What time period is being reviewed?

All years since date of appointment, reappointment or last promotion.

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

Full dossier consisting of productivity from date of previous reappointment or last promotion using the OAA core of the dossier outline with Research in View. External letters are only

required for promotion. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on the first day of business on or after September 1.

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

Committee of the Eligible Faculty reviews the dossier, meets with division director, develops a summary evaluation based on the AP&T criteria document of the school, and votes on the candidate. The summary of the AP&T assessment and numerical vote shall be forwarded to the school director.

What division director action is required?

The division director (or alternate from the executive committee for candidates who are a division director) reviews the candidate's record, develops a summary, and forwards the record and summary to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

What school director action is required?

The school director reviews materials, prepares a written evaluation with recommendations, and meets face-to-face with the faculty member. The faculty member shall be notified of his/her right to place comments in the dossier regarding the evaluation. In the case of a negative review and a decision not to reappoint the candidate, the candidate shall be notified by February 15.

Recommendations for promotion must be forwarded on to the college's Committee of the Eligible Faculty for further approvals.

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for reappointment and/or promotion.

E. Research Faculty

1. Procedures for the Annual Review of Research Faculty during the Probationary Period

When does the review take place?

Autumn Semester; in the first year of appointment, the review is in Spring semester.

What time period is being reviewed?

Previous contract year or in the first year of appointment, time since hire.

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

The Research in View version of the core dossier must be submitted. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on the first day of business on or after September 1

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

Committee of the Eligible Faculty reviews the dossier, meets with division director, and develops a summary evaluation based on the AP&T criteria document of the school. The summary of the AP&T assessment shall be forwarded to the school director.

What division director action is required?

The division director reviews the candidate's record, develops a summary, and forwards the record and summary to the school director.

What school director action is required?

The school director reviews materials, meets with the faculty member, and prepares a written evaluation. The faculty member shall be notified of his/her right to place comments in the dossier regarding the evaluation.

In the event of a negative review and a decision for non-renewal during the probationary period the faculty member must be notified by February 15.

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for reappointment and/or promotion.

2. Procedures for the Annual Review of Research Faculty who are Not Seeking Promotion and who are Not Under the Probationary Period

When does the review take place?

Spring Semester

What time period is being reviewed?

Year since last review

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

Abbreviated dossier consisting of the past year's productivity using Research in View. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on March 15

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

None

What division director action is required?

The division director reviews the candidate's record, develops a summary, and forwards the record and summary to the school director.

What school director action is required?

The school director reviews materials and meet face to face with the division director and faculty member. The school director prepares a written evaluation (after the meeting, if one occurred). The faculty member shall be notified of his/her right to place comments in the dossier regarding the evaluation.

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for reappointment and/or promotion.

3. Procedures for the Annual Review of Research Faculty Being Considered for Promotion or Reappointment**When does the review take place?**

Autumn Semester

What time period is being reviewed?

All years since date of appointment, reappointment, or last promotion.

What type of documentation should be prepared by faculty for submission?

Full dossier consisting of productivity from date of previous reappointment or last promotion using the OAA core of the dossier outline with Research in View. External letters are only required for promotion. Additional documentation to clarify accomplishments may be submitted as required.

To whom and when is the documentation submitted?

Director of the school on the first day of business on or after September 1.

What Committee of the Eligible Faculty action is required?

Committee of the Eligible Faculty reviews the dossier, meets with division director, develops a summary evaluation based on the AP&T criteria document of the school, and votes on the candidate. The summary of the AP&T assessment and numerical vote shall be forwarded to the school director.

What division director action is required?

The division director (or alternate from the executive committee for candidates who are a division director) reviews the candidate's record, develops a summary, and forwards the record and summary to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

What school director action is required?

As specified under Section V above, the school director reviews materials, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member and division director. The faculty member shall be notified of his/her right to place comments in the dossier regarding the evaluation. In the case of a negative review and a decision not to reappoint the candidate, the candidate shall be notified by February 15.

Recommendations for promotion must be forwarded on to the college's Committee of the Eligible Faculty for further approvals.

How is the annual evaluation documented?

The letter from school director and comments from the candidate, if provided, are part of the permanent employee record and are included in the dossier for reappointment and/or promotion.

VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards**A. Criteria**

Salary adjustments and other performance-based rewards will be based entirely on merit, except when the college or university mandates an "across the board" or "minimum" flat or percentage salary adjustment. Merit salary increases are based on the same criteria used for promotion and tenure for tenure-track faculty and for renewal and promotion for clinical and research faculty.

B. Procedures

Salary recommendations and other rewards are determined by the school director, based on faculty achievement within the context of the current budget and individual performance during the past year and the school director's review of teaching scholarship/research and service and in the case of division directors, administrative accomplishments. **The school director, in consultation with the executive committee, uses data from the annual evaluation letters, updated when necessary, as data for merit review. Division directors submit a summary of first year faculty research, teaching, and service to the school director for merit consideration.** Merit salary decisions are made in the Summer Semester based on the faculty member's dossier for the academic year and the evaluations outlined in Section IV of this document.

C. Documentation

The amount of merit salary increase will be provided in a letter from the school director to the faculty member.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria

Tenure is regarded as recognition of the accomplishments of the faculty member and an indicator of trust in the potential contributions that the faculty member will make throughout his/her academic life. Thus, tenure is not to be thought of merely as a reward for past work.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (D) states:

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 from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (B) states:

Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) states:

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university. Promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

Criteria for promotion are outlined in three categories: teaching, scholarship, and service.

(1) Teaching

Each faculty member is expected to effectively engage students in a positive learning experience both at the undergraduate and graduate level. Instructional activities include

teaching assigned courses and independent studies, supervising clinical experiences, and research or teaching practica, advising students, and serving on student-related committees. Most courses in the school are only taught once a year, thus faculty are usually expected to prepare and teach course work dealing with widely divergent topics. With the constant changes in health care and technology, these courses require annual revision and updating.

Excellence in teaching is required. Some characteristics of teaching excellence are creativity, innovation, responsiveness to students, content relevance, and peer recognition. Evidence to support the quality of instruction should be broad-based, comprehensive, and systematic. The following criteria constitute accomplishments characteristic of individuals worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure.

(a) *Required Teaching Criteria*

1. Teach assigned courses, including annual updating of course content.
2. Serve assigned roles in supervising and mentoring students (e.g., advising, serving as a member of thesis, dissertation or examination committees)
3. Demonstrate excellence in teaching as evaluated by peers, students, administrators, consultants, and others as deemed appropriate.

(b) *Criteria for Excellence in Teaching*

All faculty must provide some evidence of excellence in teaching. The dossier must reflect a systematic process of teaching/learning evaluation to produce excellence in all teaching activities. Excellence can be defined by a broad range of measures, including student ratings, peer evaluations, increased efficiency and/or effectiveness, meeting the needs of diverse student populations, novel curricular offerings, and/or increased access. Table 1 below provides examples of metrics that can be used to demonstrate excellence in teaching.

(2) *Research and Scholarship*

In the text below, the terms research and scholarship are used interchangeably.

In keeping with the vision and mission of The Ohio State University, all tenure- faculty must conduct research, including scholarly writing and publication, as a condition for promotion and tenure. Research and other scholarly works establish the faculty member as an expert in his/her discipline. Such activity leads to the generation and dissemination of new knowledge, improved methodologies, program developments, or other advances in professional practice. Scholarly work may take place in classroom, clinic, community, laboratory, library, or other setting. Scholarly work may be quantitative or qualitative in nature.

The faculty member's scholarly work shall be of high quality, independent, significant, and original. The body of scholarship must be organized around a central theme or focus, and shall be of sufficient quality and quantity to be recognized as making a significant contribution to that area of study.

Recognition of the ability to pursue or direct an independent program of inquiry does not diminish the high value placed on collaborative scholarly efforts within the school or in concert with other cooperating faculty or facilities. In collaborative endeavors, the degree of the faculty member's contributions should be identified and must reflect qualities of leadership and significance. High impact publications in which faculty members have participated as a member of a broader team-based approach to manuscript development and publication will also be recognized as evidence of scholarship especially when specific roles in team scholarship demonstrate unique or leadership contributions. Evidence of ongoing, continuous development of research ability and reputation is reflected by the following criteria:

(a) *Required Scholarship Criteria*

1. Provide evidence of a focused, thematic area of research or scholarship with demonstration of national impact and recognition.
2. Actively seek and demonstrate success in obtaining internal and/or external funding for their program of scholarship. Attaining a priority score or other indicator of quality in a grant submitted may be considered in lieu of funding when the dossier clearly demonstrates that the candidate's publication record and other evidence of excellence in scholarship has produced a growing national reputation.
3. Demonstrate a sustained publication record in peer-reviewed journals, including a substantial proportion as first or senior author, based on scholarship conducted while a faculty member in the school.

All faculty must provide evidence of excellence in research and scholarship. Examples of metrics for demonstrating excellence in research scholarship are provided in Table 1 below.

(3) *Service*

Faculty are expected to actively participate in academic and professional service. Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure shall serve on divisional and school committees and shall participate in other activities in support of the missions of the divisions and the school. This basic level of required service may be enhanced by such things as serving on college and university committees, advising student organizations, or organizing symposia and programs.

The faculty member shall participate in activities at the local, state, and/or national level, or promote academic rigor by serving as a manuscript and/or abstract reviewer or engage in similar activity(ies) in support of his/her profession. This basic level of expected service may be enhanced by other service at the local, state, national, or international level, such as elected or appointed office, participation in program planning, professional consultation, delivery of patient care, or involvement in accreditation and credentialing activities.

Faculty may also provide service within the community as members or leaders in various organizations, by participating in volunteer activities, or through engagement in other ways that

make a positive professional contribution. There should be evidence of commitment to service as reflected by the criteria listed in the table below.

Table 1: Representative Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor, Tenure-track, With Tenure.

Educational Prep

Research Based Doctoral degree

Research/Scholarly Activity

A *productive* program of independent research/scholarly activity that has a specific area of focus, sustainability, and national impact. Demonstrated excellence in research and scholarship as evidenced by:

Productivity

- Peer reviewed publications (typically 12-14 since appointment as an assistant professor)
- Research presentations, abstracts at national professional meetings.

National Impact

Demonstration of research impact through any of these indicators:

- Invited national presentations.
- Number of citations or H index
- Publication in preeminent journals for the candidate's profession
- Research awards
- Invited to a federal agency review panel
- Major author or editor of books or chapters in the area of scholarship
- Entrepreneurial accomplishments linked to the scholarly focus such as invention disclosures and similar reports

Focus and Independence

- A significant number (6-7) of first or senior authored publication in high quality peer-reviewed journals **since appointment as assistant professor**
- A majority of publications, presentations and grants align with candidate's scholarly focus

Sustainability

Evidence of sustainability **by any combination** of the following:

- PI on 1-2 peer-reviewed nationally competitive extramural grants that support the productivity of the independent researcher across multiple years Submitted nationally competitive grants that are scored (2-3)
 - PI on industry contracts (1-2).
 - Co-I on multiple nationally competitive peer reviewed grants
 - Patented products
 - Federal training grants
-
-

Teaching

Excellence

Table 1: Representative Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor, Tenure-track, With Tenure.

Faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching. Examples of evidence of excellence in teaching include:

- Peer classroom evaluations
- Student Evaluation of Instructor scores
- External evaluation of teaching materials that are sent out for review and rating.
- Recognition of mentoring/advising student research.
- Course and instructional program development
- Teaching awards

National Impact

Although the case for promotion will usually be documented on the basis of national impact for scholarly activity, national impact in teaching can also support the case

- Continuing education lectures at state and national meetings
- Teaching awards given by the SHRS and COM.
- Invited presentations or peer reviewed presentations
- Scholarship in Teaching
- Training grants or educational grants
- Authoring book chapters or books

Service

Service excellence can come in the form of divisional, college, and university service as well as national professional service.

Excellence

Examples of excellence in service include:

- Elected or appointed offices for national professional societies.
- Outreach and service learning grants; service to promote diversity
- Participation in division, college, or university committees, task forces, and councils.
- Participation in program planning, program accreditation or program outcome assessment.
- Reviewer for 2-3 professional and scientific journals.
- Journal Review Board member
- Grant review for university competitions or state level competitions
- Consultation, patient care
- Participation in student service

2. Promotion to Professor

a. General Principles for Promotion to Professor

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching,

has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized internationally, and has demonstrated **national** leadership in service.

For teaching, scholarship, and service, the same categories of activities listed as required for the associate professor apply for the promotion to professor. Likewise, the same types of activities can be listed as evidence of excellence for both. For promotion to professor, the whole career will be assessed. The expectation is that the level of accomplishment will be consistent during the period after promotion to associate professor, such that productivity will have been sustained or increased since that promotion. In addition to the overarching principle that a significant national **leadership** or international impact must be demonstrated for the rank of professor, the following specific criteria apply.

b. Specific Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Representative evidence is listed in Table 2.

(1) Teaching

- All criteria for associate professor apply
- Demonstrated excellence in post-professional graduate teaching as thesis or dissertation advisor
- Teaching excellence recognized beyond the school, such as invited teaching for other departments or colleges, or national, or international level.

(2) Research and Scholarship

- All criteria for associate professor apply
- Demonstrate a sustained record of peer-reviewed, nationally competitive funding for the program of scholarship. Educational training grants related to a program of scholarship qualify only for those on the educator/scholar pathway
- Demonstrate sustained record of publication of peer-reviewed scholarship, with a substantial portion as first or senior author, in leading national or international journals,

(3) Service

- There should be evidence of excellence in service at the national and/or international level.

Table 2: Representative Evidence for Promotion to the Rank of Professor with Tenure.

Research/Scholarly Activity

A sustained, independent, eminent, focused scholarly program that demonstrates international impact

Productivity

- Peer reviewed scientific publications (typically **12-14** since promotion to associate

Table 2: Representative Evidence for Promotion to the Rank of Professor with Tenure.

professor).

- **Invited** Research presentations at national and international conferences.

- **Impact**

- Invited national and international presentations
- Number of citations or H index
- Publication in preeminent journals for candidate's profession
- National or international research awards
- Invited to a federal agency review panel
- Major author or editor of books or chapters in the area of scholarship
- Entrepreneurial accomplishments linked to the scholarly focus such as invention disclosures and similar reports

Focus and Independence

- A significant number (10-12) of first or senior authored publications in high quality peer-reviewed journals.
- Most publications represent the candidate's research line(s).

Sustainability

Evidence of research program sustainability can include a combination of the following:

- PI on 2-3 peer-reviewed nationally competitive extramural grants that support the productivity of the independent researcher across multiple years PI on industry contracts (1-2)
- Co-I on multiple nationally competitive peer reviewed grants
- Federal training grants
- Patented products

Teaching

All criteria for Associate Professor apply

Excellence

- Evidence for excellent in teaching includes:
- Peer classroom evaluations
- Student Evaluation of Instructor scores
- Graduate advising awards or high ratings
- Graduate student success and awards.
- Leadership in course development, curricular design and program evaluation

National Impact

Although the case for promotion will usually be documented on the basis of national impact for scholarly activity, national impact in teaching can also support the case

- Presentations at national and international forums.
- Positive teaching evaluations from national audiences
- Teaching awards from the school, college or university
- Invited national and international presentations.
- Training grants or educational grants.

Table 2: Representative Evidence for Promotion to the Rank of Professor with Tenure.

-
- Authoring book chapter or books
-

Service

Service excellence can include divisional, college, and university service; National Service is expected.

Excellence

Excellence in service may be evidenced by a combination of the following :

- Elected or appointed offices for state and national professional societies.
 - Leadership roles in outreach and service grants and/or service to promote diversity
 - Participation in college and university committees, task forces, and councils
 - Leadership in program planning, program accreditation or program outcome assessment.
 - Editorial board of professional or scientific journals
 - Grant reviewer for national organizations or federal agencies.
 - Leadership in patient care or consultation
 - Leadership in student service organizations
-

3. Promotion of Clinical Faculty

The school recognizes that the APT document for the college specifies the potential to recognize excellence in clinical practice in lieu of scholarship for clinical faculty members who have at least 90% effort dedicated to clinical practice. In case any individual clinical faculty member's contract in the school stipulates 90% or greater effort in clinical practice, then that individual's scholarship would be judged on appropriate examples of the standards for excellence in clinical practice as set forth in the college's APT document.

a. Criteria for Continuing Appointment for an Instructor, Clinical

Annually during the probationary period, the Instructor, Clinical must show progress toward meeting or exceeding the following criteria for awarding renewal of a 3 – 5 year contract with promotion to Assistant Professor. Appointments at the instructor rank are not renewable past the initial three year appointment. The candidate must succeed in achieving the criteria necessary for promotion to assistant professor in order to be renewed. Progress towards meeting these criteria will be the focus of the annual review.

- Perform an equitable share of service and administrative tasks in compliance with division and school policies and procedures,
- Teach assigned courses and independent studies including periodic updating of content; supervise and /or coordinate clinical /practice experiences,
- Have a record of excellence in teaching such as:
 - Receive consistently high-level evaluations of teaching performance by peers, students, administrators, consultants, and others as deemed appropriate

- Receive recognition or awards for distinguished teaching and/or other educational accomplishments
 - Participate in the development of new courses or curricula
 - Publish material of an instructional nature or give evidence of production of other forms of teaching materials (e.g., videotapes, computer programs, laboratory manuals)
 - Develop creative or innovative approaches to teaching in the health professions, e.g., problem-based learning, distance education, and service –learning courses
 - Offer or direct continuing education programs for local, state, or national organizations
 - Participate as an invited speaker at the state, national, or international level
 - Demonstrate excellence in honors student advisement/education.
- Have a record of effective service such as:
 - Professional practice activities
 - Leadership in local, regional, or state professional organizations
 - Active contributions to student, divisional and school service
 - Outreach and diversity service
 - Program planning, program accreditation
 - Receive recognition for service at the school, community, or professional levels.
 - Have a record of contributing to scholarly activity.

b. *Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Assistant Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences*

Promotion to Assistant Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences is based upon successful completion of the doctorate or other terminal degree and/or clinical credentials, and meeting or exceeding the criteria for appointment as an Assistant Professor, Clinical.

c. *Criteria for Renewal of Assistant Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences*

Annually during the probationary period, the Assistant Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences must show progress toward meeting or exceeding the renewal criteria. The criteria for renewal with a 3 – 5 year contract as an Assistant Professor, Clinical are:

1. Perform an equitable share of teaching, service and administrative tasks in compliance with division and school policies and procedures,
2. Teach assigned courses and independent studies including periodic updating of content; supervise and /or coordinate clinical /practice experiences,
3. Demonstrate excellence in teaching through one or more of the following:

- Receive consistently high-level evaluations of teaching performance by peers, students, administrators, consultants, and others as deemed appropriate
 - Receive recognition or awards for distinguished teaching and/or other educational accomplishments
 - Participate in the development of new courses or curricula
 - Publish materials of an instructional nature or give evidence of production of other forms of teaching materials (e.g., videotapes, computer programs, laboratory manuals)
 - Develop creative or innovative approaches to teaching in the health professions, e.g., problem-based learning, distance education, and service –learning courses
 - Offer or direct continuing education programs for local, state, or national organizations
 - Participate as an invited speaker at the state, national, or international level
 - Demonstrate excellence in graduate or honors student advisement/education.
4. Demonstrate effective service through one or more of the following activities:
- Professional practice activities
 - Leadership in local, regional, or state professional organizations
 - Active contributions to student, divisional and school service
 - Program planning, program accreditation
 - Receive recognition for service at the school, community, or professional levels.
5. Have a record of contributing to research and scholarly productivity such as:
- Contributing authorship to peer-reviewed publications, review papers, books, book chapters, or case studies
 - Contributing to grantsmanship
 - Making scholarly presentations

Expectations for scholarly productivity should reflect time allotted for scholarship.

d. *Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences*

Promotion to Associate Professor Clinical must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has established, through teaching, scholarship, and service, a national reputation and has demonstrated an impact on the field. Since the appointment to the rank of assistant professor, the candidate has:

1. Performed an equitable share of teaching, service and administrative tasks in compliance with school policies and procedures.
2. Established a strong record of teaching excellence as demonstrated by consistent positive evaluations by students, external evaluators, and peers, which may include awards or other recognitions. In addition to teaching evaluations, the faculty member

should demonstrate substantial impact on the teaching programs, which may include innovations or program development.

3. Established a record of leadership in service to the school, the institution, profession and the community, which may include active national participation in professional societies, or other organizations relevant to the mission of the institution.
4. Demonstrated multiple contributions to scholarship as reflected by publication of case reports, book chapters, participation in grantsmanship, research projects or clinical trials, or contributions as contributing author on peer-reviewed journal publications, or presentations at professional meetings.

Table 3 summarizes examples of metrics used to assess faculty in the clinical for promotion to associate professor. It is assumed that this faculty member has a distributed load of 65% teaching; 25% research and 10% service.

Table 3: Representative Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor, Clinical

Educational Prep

Earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study

Recognition and Impact

Nationally recognized contribution in teaching, service, or scholarship

Teaching

Excellence in Teaching

Examples of evidence for excellence in teaching include:

- Peer classroom evaluations
- Student Evaluation of Instructor scores (generally at or above unit average)
- External evaluation of teaching materials that are sent out for review and rating.
- Recognition of mentoring/advising graduate students, instructors.
- Course and instructional program development
- Teaching awards

Excellence in Clinical Education

Examples of evidence for excellence in clinical education include

- Peer evaluations of clinical education administration
- Student evaluation of clinical education administration
- External evaluation by affiliated sites
- Recognition for mentoring/advising of preceptors.
- Recognition for or development of an innovative clinical education program
- Recruitment and/or retention of clinical sites

National Impact of Teaching

- Continuing education lectures at state, regional or national meetings
 - Teaching awards given by SHRS and COM.
 - Invited presentations or peer reviewed presentations
-

Service

Service excellence can come in the form of divisional, college, and university service as well as national professional service.

Excellence

Excellence in service may be evidenced by a combination of the following:

- Elected or appointed offices for national professional societies.
 - Outreach and service learning grants; service to promote diversity
 - Participation in division, college, or university committees, task forces, and councils.
 - Participation in program planning, program accreditation or program outcome assessment.
 - Reviewer for 2-3 professional and scientific journals.
 - Journal Review Board member
 - Grant review for university competitions or state level competitions
 - Consultation, patient care
 - Participation in student service
-

Scholarly Activity

Contributions to scholarship as evidenced by authorship or development of innovative, nationally recognized educational/clinical programs.

Productivity

- Peer reviewed publications (6 or more) since appointment as an assistant professor
- Research presentations, abstracts at national professional meetings.

National Impact

Demonstration of research impact through indicators such as the following:

- Invited national presentations.
- Publication in highly regarded journals for the candidate's area of scholarship or chapters or book publication
- Scholarship awards
- Invited to a federal agency review panel
- Major author or editor of books or chapters in the area of scholarship
- Federal training grant

Focus

Publication in books or journals with an impact beyond the state level.

A majority of publications, presentations or grants align with candidate's scholarship focus

Continuity

Grants and contracts sufficient to support the scholarship program, such as one or more of the following:

- Ongoing funded position within a program of scholarship with demonstration that the position is sustainable
 - Co-I on 1extramural grant
 - Co-I on industry contract
 - Patented product
 - Training grant
-

e. Criteria for Renewal of Associate Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

To renew a term as Associate Professor, the candidate must continue to meet or exceed the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, Clinical. Expectations for scholarly productivity should reflect time allotted for scholarship.

Criteria for Promotion to Rank of Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

Promotion to Professor, Clinical must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has established, through teaching and service, a national or international reputation, and has demonstrated a substantial impact on the field. See Table 4. Since the appointment to the rank of associate professor, the candidate has:

1. Performed an equitable share of teaching, service, and administrative tasks in compliance with school policies and procedures.
2. A sustained record of excellence in teaching as demonstrated by consistent positive evaluations by students, external peers, and peers. Candidates for promotion to professor should also demonstrate accomplishment in educational leadership as reflected by development of courses or programs, or other educational innovations.
3. A sustained record of leadership in service to the institution, profession and the community, which may include national professional societies, or other organizations relevant to the mission of the institution.
4. A sustained record of leadership in scholarship as reflected by multiple publications of case reports, book chapters, books, participation in grants, research projects, or clinical trials, or contributions as a contributing author on peer-reviewed journal publications.

Table 4: Representative Evidence for Promotion to Professor Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

Educational Prep
Earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study
Recognition
Nationally or internationally recognized contribution in teaching, service or scholarship
Teaching
All criteria for Associate Professor apply
Excellence in Teaching
Demonstrates excellence in teaching. Examples of evidence for excellence in teaching include:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Peer classroom evaluations• Student Evaluation of Instructor scores (generally at or above unit average)• Student advising awards or high ratings• Graduate student success and awards.• Leadership in course development, curricular design and program evaluation

National to International Impact of Teaching

- Presentations at national and international forums.
- Positive teaching evaluations from national audiences
- Teaching awards external to the school
- Invited presentations or peer reviewed presentations.

Examples for Clinical Education Administrator

- Peer evaluations of indicating high quality clinical education administration
- Excellent student evaluation of clinical education administration
- Leadership in clinical program development and evaluation
- Presentations at national and international forums.
- Invited presentations.
- Retention of clinical sites

Service

Service excellence can include divisional, college, and university services. National Service is expected.

Excellence in service may be evidenced by a combination of the following :

- Elected or appointed offices for national professional societies.
- Leadership roles in outreach and service grants or
- Participation in college and university committees, task forces, and councils
- Leadership in program planning, program accreditation or program outcome assessment.
- Editorial board of professional or scientific journals
- Leadership in patient care or consultation
- Leadership in student service organizations

Scholarly Activity

Contributions to scholarship as evidenced by authorship or development of innovative, internationally recognized educational/clinical programs.

Demonstrated eminence in scholarship through activities such as:

Peer Reviewed Publications

- Peer reviewed scientific publications (12 or more, with 6 since promotion to associate professor).
- Research presentations, abstract at national and international conferences.

National to International Impact

Demonstration of research impact through these indicators:

- Invited national and international presentations
- Publication in preeminent journals for candidate's profession
- scholarship awards
- Invited to a review panel or editorial board for a journal in their field
- Major author or editor of books or chapters in the area of scholarship

Research Focus

- Publication in books or journals with an impact at the national and international level.
 - A majority of publications, presentations or grants align with candidate's scholarship
-

focus

- Most publications represent the candidate's research line(s).

Continuity:

Grants and contracts sufficient to support the scholarship program, such as one or more of the following:

- Co-I on an foundation or private or extramural grants that support the productivity of the research
 - Co-I on industry contracts
 - Co-I on federal grants
 - Patented products
 - Training grants
-

f. *Criteria for Renewal of Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences*

To renew an appointment as Professor of Clinical Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, the candidate must continue to meet or exceed the criteria for promotion to Professor, Clinical . Expectations for scholarly productivity should reflect time allotted for scholarship.

4. Promotion of Research Faculty

In the Research track, the criteria for promotion focus principally on the category of research, and the standards are comparable to those used for the Tenure-track for each faculty rank, with the exception that a higher level of productivity in research will be expected in the research .

a. *Promotion: Associate Professor on the Research-Track*

The criteria for promotion of research faculty in the school are identical to those for tenure-track faculty, with two important exceptions. First, there is no expectation for accomplishments in teaching for research faculty. The case will be made principally on accomplishments in research and scholarship. The second difference is that a higher level of productivity and impact in research will be required of research faculty. Research faculty members have no teaching expectation and will normally have research time in the 90 – 100% range, about twice that of a tenure-track faculty member in the school. Therefore, the research faculty member should have about twice the productivity of the tenure-track faculty member, and should have a record of accomplishment comparable to faculty in the basic science departments in the College of Medicine. A consistent record of extramural funding providing salary support for all time allotted to research will be expected for promotion to associate professor in the research track.

The research faculty member will also be expected to have a record of service aligned with the program of research, such as service in reviewing for journals or granting agencies. The overarching standard for promotion to associate professor will be a national reputation and national impact for the program of scholarship.

b. Promotion: Professor on the Research Track

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 leadership role or an international level of impact and recognition. As with promotion to associate professor on the research, the criteria for promotion to professor on the research are the same as for tenure-track faculty, with two exceptions. First, teaching is not required. And second, the case will be made principally based on scholarship. A higher level of productivity and impact in research is required, comparable to the level expected of the basic science faculty in the College of Medicine. Service activities should be related to the program of scholarship.

B. Procedures

The school's procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 for tenure-track faculty and 3335-7-05 for clinical faculty.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

a. General Considerations

Consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-04:

(1) The office of academic affairs defines the format and outline of a document, called a dossier, to be used for the documentation of accomplishments by all candidates to be reviewed for promotion and tenure and by all probationary tenure-track faculty for annual reviews. Information from the office of academic affairs also explains the review process at the college and university level, information about any legal considerations affecting promotion and tenure evaluations, examples of criteria by which candidates for promotion and tenure are evaluated and other information useful to the candidate and the school for carrying out reviews. Candidates are encouraged to consult the Office of Academic Affairs website.

(2) All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed by the eligible faculty on the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and by the school director. Candidates will also be reviewed at the college and university levels. The school director is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the board of trustees (if positive).

(3) The review for tenure during the penultimate year of a probationary period is mandatory and must take place.

A faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty 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 school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year.

(4) Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the school director in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the school, the school director shall inform the dean or the executive vice president and provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the penultimate probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.

b. Review Procedures for Promotion

(1) Preparation of the Core of the Dossier

The candidate shall have primary responsibility for preparing, according to office of academic affairs guidelines, a core dossier documenting his or her accomplishments.

In the school, candidates are required to prepare the dossier electronically in Research in View. In the event that the version printed from Research in View contains errors or omissions, the candidate should provide clarifying documentation to correct the error.

(2) Completion of the Dossier

The candidate prepares the core of the dossier, but certain sections such as external evaluations or reports from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty of the school cannot be completed by the candidate. According to university Rule 3335-6-04, the school director has ultimate responsibility for completion of those sections of the dossier, such as external evaluations, that are not completed by the candidate.

Many faculty in the school report directly to a division director. Under the authority granted by faculty rule 3335-6-04 (D) (4), the school director delegates responsibility for completion of certain portions of the dossier to the relevant division director for faculty members in that division. The school director exercises oversight for this process and retains responsibility for completion of the remainder of the dossier.

Faculty in the school, including division directors, may also report directly to the director of the school. In this case, the portions of dossier completion that would be delegated to the division director are delegated to a member of the school's executive committee in order to maintain a comparable process for all faculty regardless of administrative title.

Completion of the dossier includes the following steps:

(3) Internal Evidence

Each candidate shall have an internal evaluation prepared as a written report for inclusion in the dossier. For faculty in a division, the division director shall prepare this report. For a candidate who is a division director or who reports directly to the school director, the executive committee shall select an alternate from among the members of the executive committee.

The division director or alternate shall gather internal evidence of the quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service from students and peers, as appropriate, within the school. This shall include one or more summative peer evaluations of teaching. Evaluative comments should be sought from other units at this university in which the candidate has appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not.

A course offered by the candidate or equivalent solitary work product may be sent out for external review. This type of limited external review will be considered supporting evidence for internal or external reviews, not a full external review.

The division director or alternate shall submit a summative letter describing the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service. This written evaluation shall be due by the close of business on the first regular business day on or after September 1.

(4) Review by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall meet face-to-face to deliberate and to prepare a written report for the school director providing the eligible faculty's assessment of quality and effectiveness of the candidate's teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service.

Prior to this meeting, a member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall verify the candidate's publications as required for the dossier. For the meeting, a member will volunteer to be the procedures oversight designee.

Presentation of the case during the meeting shall be heard only by the eligible faculty of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The presentation shall commence with oral presentation by the internal evaluator (division director or alternate) of the written internal evaluation. Following this presentation, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will present a parallel assessment of the candidate's accomplishments. The internal evaluator shall remain present for this presentation so that any discrepancies in the candidate's record of accomplishments may be resolved. At the conclusion of this portion of the review, the internal evaluator shall be excluded from further deliberations on the candidate.

The eligible faculty of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall then review and discuss the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service and shall vote on the candidate. A written report of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty's assessment, including both strengths and weaknesses, and the numerical vote of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall

be prepared by the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and forwarded to the school director for inclusion in the dossier.

This review shall be completed by October 31.

(5) Assessment by the School Director

Once the report of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty is added to the dossier, the school director is responsible for preparing a separate written assessment of the case and recommendation for the dean for inclusion in the dossier.

This assessment shall be completed by November 15.

(6) External Letters

The division director (for faculty in that division) or alternate from the executive committee (for division directors or faculty not in a division) shall obtain letters from external evaluators.

Some of the external evaluators should be suggested by the candidate and some by the division director or school director; no more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier may be from persons suggested by the candidate. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the scholarly work. They may not be former advisors, collaborators, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that can reduce objectivity. Once the list of external evaluators is determined, the candidate shall be notified and given an opportunity to review the list before the materials are sent to the external evaluators. If the candidate identifies anyone on the list whom the candidate believes cannot provide an objective opinion, the candidate can request that an alternative evaluator be selected. The division director or school director shall determine whether to grant this request or not.

All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the above authorized persons may not be included in the dossier.

A sample letter as provided in Appendix B shall serve as the text for each request for external evaluation. The candidate's c.v. along with 3 examples of scholarly work, typically peer-reviewed journal articles, shall be sent to the external reviewer. The candidate will be allowed to select the examples of scholarly work being evaluated.

(7) Comments Process

When the Committee of the Eligible Faculty's report and school director's letter have been completed, the candidate shall be notified within one business day in writing of the completion of the school's review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate shall be provided a

copy of these reports upon request. The candidate may provide the school director with written comments on the school's review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty chair and/or the school director may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the school's review is permitted.

(8) Forwarding the Dossier to the College

When the dossier is complete, including comments, the school director shall forward the dossier with all internal and external evaluations, candidate comments on the school's review and school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty and/or school director responses to those comments, if any, to the dean of the college. After review at the college, the dossier shall also be reviewed at the university level.

(9) Faculty with Joint Appointments

tenure-track faculty may only have one tenure initiating unit (TIU). Faculty with a joint appointment between two or more TIU's, with salary shared among them, shall have one TIU named as the primary home of the appointment. Faculty in this circumstance shall have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the chairs of the respective TIU's developed at the time of the initial appointment. For an example, see the following sample document from OAA: <http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html> . Among other things as required by the university in faculty position letters of offer, this MOU shall indicate which department is the primary home of the faculty member.

The AP&T document for the TIU that is the primary home shall serve as the document governing promotion and tenure decisions for that faculty member. The chair(s) of the other TIU(s) shall (each) provide an evaluative letter of the faculty member's contributions. Evaluative letter(s) provided by the chair(s) of the other TIU(s) shall be included in the appropriate section of the dossier. The deadline for this shall conform to the deadline for the chair of the home TIU, such that all evaluative letters are available at the time the candidate is offered the opportunity to review the dossier in the comments process.

2. Clinical Faculty

a. General Considerations

According to Faculty Rule 3335-7-08, annual review, reappointment/non-reappointment, and promotion review procedures for clinical faculty shall be consistent with review procedures established for tenure- faculty, including those set forth in rules 3335-6-03 and 3335-6-04 with the following exceptions:

- The college dean's decision shall be final with respect to reappointment and non-reappointment and with respect to denial of promotion. In other words, there is no review at the university level for a negative decision.

- The university rules give the school the option as to whether to require external evaluation of faculty in the clinical track. In the school, external evaluations ARE a required part of the process for consideration of promotion. External evaluations are not solicited and will not be considered in the decision for reappointment vs. non-reappointment at the same rank at the end of a contract period.

b. *Initial Reappointment or Promotion at the End of the Probationary Period*

At the end of the year preceding the penultimate year of the probationary period, the school director decides whether or not to recommend reappointment to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and shall notify the clinical faculty member in writing of the decision. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. If the decision is not to recommend reappointment, the final year of the probationary contract shall be the final year of employment.

If the decision of the school director is to recommend reappointment, the decision must be reviewed by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty during the penultimate year of the probationary contract. After the school director's decision to seek reappointment, the school director shall consult with the candidate to determine whether to request reappointment at the same rank or to request reappointment with promotion to a higher rank. A faculty member may ask to be considered for promotion review; however, the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may decline to put forth a faculty member for promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year.

Both the school director and the candidate must concur for a decision to seek reappointment with promotion to a higher rank. If either party favors reappointment at the same rank without promotion, then that is how the request must go forward to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

For initial reappointment of clinical faculty in the school, the exact same procedures followed for promotion of tenure-track faculty will be followed, with the following exceptions:

- The criteria for clinical are described in section VII.A.4.
 - For reappointment without promotion, criteria at the current rank will be applied, with expectations for productivity commensurate with the time in rank and the time allotted for teaching, scholarship, and service.
 - For promotion, criteria at the rank sought will be applied. While the tenet of flexibility will guide decisions for promotion, insufficient time allotted for teaching, scholarship, and service cannot justify lower standards in the baseline requirements for promotion.
 -
- The recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty level will take one of three possible outcomes.
 - Recommendation for non-reappointment. This would result if the faculty member has not satisfied the expectations for the current rank.

- Recommendation for reappointment at the present rank. This would result if the faculty member has satisfied the expectations for the current rank but has not met the requirements for promotion to higher rank. This decision is possible for clinical faculty at any rank, except Instructor. This recommendation is possible for faculty for whom the school director requested consideration of reappointment at the present rank or reappointment with promotion to a higher rank.
- Recommendation for reappointment with promotion. This would result if the faculty member has satisfied the requirements for promotion to higher rank. The recommendation can be made only if the school director requested consideration of reappointment with promotion to a higher rank and the appropriate procedures for promotion have been followed.
- The result of a positive initial reappointment or promotion decision for clinical faculty from the school will be reviewed by the college dean and at the university levels.
- If the initial reappointment or promotion is approved at all levels, the result is the offering of a 3-5 year contract, not the award of tenure.
- If the initial reappointment is not approved, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment.

c. *Mid-Contract Promotion for Clinical Faculty After the Probationary Period*

A clinical faculty member in the school who has already passed the probationary period may request consideration for promotion at any time during the current contract. The exact same procedures followed for tenure-track faculty promotions will be followed for clinical faculty promotions, with the following exceptions:

- The criteria for promotion of clinical track are described in section VII.A.4.
- The result of a positive mid-contract promotion decision for clinical faculty is promotion. The decision as to whether to offer a new 3-5 year contract comes at the in the penultimate year of the present contract and is separate from the decision for promotion.
- A negative decision for promotion mid-contract does not affect the terms of the present contract.

The school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year.

d. *Consideration for Reappointment With or Without Promotion for Clinical Faculty at the end of a Non-Probationary Contract Period*

These procedures are the same as described above in VII.B.3.b. for the initial reappointment with the one exception:

- External evaluation letters are required only if the candidate is seeking promotion at the time of reappointment.

3. Research Faculty

a. General Considerations

According to Faculty Rule 3335-7-36, annual review, reappointment/non-reappointment, and promotion review procedures for research faculty shall be consistent with review procedures established for tenure- faculty, including those set forth in rules 3335-6-03 and 3335-6-04 with the following exceptions:

- The college dean's decision shall be final with respect to reappointment and non-reappointment and with respect to denial of promotion. In other words, there is no review at the university level for a negative decision.
- The university rules give the school the option as to whether to require external evaluation of faculty in the research track. In the school, external evaluations are a required part of the process for consideration of promotion. External evaluations are not solicited and will not be considered in the decision for reappointment vs. non-reappointment at the same rank at the end of a contract period.

b. Initial Reappointment or Promotion at the End of the Probationary Period

At the end of the year preceding the penultimate year of the probationary period, the school director decides whether or not to recommend reappointment to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and shall notify the research faculty member in writing of the decision. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. If the decision is not to recommend reappointment, the final year of the probationary contract shall be the final year of employment.

If the decision of the school director is to recommend reappointment, the decision must be reviewed by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty during the penultimate year of the probationary contract. A faculty member may ask to be considered for promotion review at this time; however, the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may decline to put forth a faculty member for promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year.

For initial reappointment of research faculty in the school, the exact same procedures followed for promotion of tenure-track faculty will be followed, with the following exceptions:

- The criteria for research are described in section VII.A.4.
 - For reappointment without promotion, criteria at the current rank will be applied.
 - For promotion, criteria at the rank sought will be applied.
- The recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty level will take one of three possible outcomes.

- Recommendation for non-reappointment. This would result if the faculty member has not satisfied the expectations for the current rank.
- Recommendation for reappointment at the present rank. This would result if the faculty member has satisfied the expectations for the current rank but has not met the requirements for promotion to higher rank. This decision is possible for research faculty at any rank, except Instructor. This recommendation is possible for faculty for whom the school director requested consideration of reappointment at the present rank or reappointment with promotion to a higher rank.
- Recommendation for reappointment with promotion. This would result if the faculty member has satisfied the requirements for promotion to higher rank. The recommendation can be made only if the school director requested consideration of reappointment with promotion to a higher rank and the appropriate procedures for promotion have been followed.
- The result of a positive initial reappointment or promotion decision for research faculty from the school will be reviewed by the college dean and at the university levels.
- If the initial reappointment or promotion is approved at all levels, the result is the offering of a 3-5 year contract, not the award of tenure.
- If the initial reappointment is not approved, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment.

c. *Mid-Contract Promotion for Research Faculty After the Probationary Period*

A research faculty member in the school who has already passed the probationary period may request consideration for promotion at any time during the current contract. The exact same procedures followed for tenure-track faculty promotions will be followed for research faculty promotions, with the following exceptions:

- The criteria for promotion of research are described in section VII.A.4.
- The result of a positive mid-contract promotion decision for research faculty is promotion. The decision as to whether to offer a new contract comes at the end of the year prior to the penultimate year of the present contracts and is separate from the decision for promotion.
- A negative decision for promotion mid-contract does not affect the terms of the present contract.

The school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may decline to put forth a Research faculty member for promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty may not deny a Research faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year.

Consideration for Reappointment With or Without Promotion for Research Faculty at the end of a Non-Probationary Contract Period

These procedures are the same as described above in VII.B.4.b. for the initial reappointment with the one exception:

- External evaluation letters are required only if the candidate is seeking promotion at the time of reappointment.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty may apply for promotions in rank paralleling those of faculty in that . The procedures for requesting such a promotion are as follows:

- The associated faculty candidate shall submit a written request for promotion to the faculty member in the school to whom he or she directly reports (typically a division director), called the supervisor in this text. This request must be accompanied by documentation of the candidate's accomplishments in a form sufficient for initial appointment at the higher rank (e.g., a C.V. or dossier) as specified in the appointments section of this document. The candidate's letter requesting promotion should highlight his/her accomplishments since the initial appointment at the previous rank and explain why the promotion is warranted.
- The supervisor shall review the candidate's accomplishments and request to determine whether the candidate's record supports the promotion. If the supervisor supports the request, he/she shall prepare a written evaluation with a recommendation for the promotion and submit this along with the documentation of the candidate's accomplishments to the school director.
- If the request for promotion is not supported by the supervisor, a written explanation along with suggestions for ways to meet the criteria shall be provided in writing to the candidate. In this case the request for promotion shall not be considered by the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty. No new request for promotion from the candidate shall be considered by the supervisor until the next academic year. At that time whether or not the supervisor denies the requested promotion, the candidate may request that the Committee of the Eligible Faculty consider the case. In this event the Supervisor shall prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's case for promotion along with the supervisor's recommendation for or against the promotion, and that evaluation along with the candidate's documentation submitted in support of the promotion shall be submitted to the school director.
- Appointments to senior ranks (associate or full professor titles) require external evaluations of the candidate's qualifications equivalent to those required for faculty. The supervisor is responsible for arranging these external evaluations following procedures duplicating those for faculty.
- When a candidate for promotion is presented by a supervisor to the school director, the school director shall provide that documentation for promotion along with the candidate's

request and the supervisor's evaluation as well as any external evaluations to the chair of the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty for review.

- If the supervisor's recommendation is positive, the chair of the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall disseminate the documentation electronically to the eligible members of the school's Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The eligible members shall review the candidate's qualifications according to the standards for an initial appointment at that rank and provide a vote along with positive or negative comments by email the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Eligible members are the same as those who would consider clinical faculty for that rank.
- If any eligible member of the committee requests an in-person meeting of the committee, or if the supervisor's recommendation is not positive, then an in-person meeting of the committee shall be required before the deliberations of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the associated vote can be considered complete.
- The chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall forward a written recommendation along with a record of the vote and a summary of comments from the committee to the school director.
- If the promotion would bring the candidate to a senior level (associate professor or professor), then the promotion and associated documentation will need to be reviewed at the college and university levels. The school director is responsible for securing these additional reviews. For promotions below this level, the school director's decision is final.

C. Documentation

Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs' Handbook serves as the model for documentation of all faculty reviews, including the annual review of probationary faculty, annual merit review, and reviews for tenure and/or promotion. These guidelines are available at the Board of Trustees website, <http://trustees.osu.edu/>. The faculty member under review bears the responsibility for preparing the dossier, according to the guidelines, in order to document his/her accomplishments. The narrative which follows details more specifically the documentation required for all faculty in the school. These guidelines are meant to supplement the Office of Academic Affairs' guidelines, not to replace them.

In the school, the candidate is required to submit his or her dossier through the Research in View system. In the event that the report from Research in View contains errors or omissions, the candidate may submit supplementary documentation in order to correct or clarify the Research in View document.

The faculty member is responsible for completing the core of the dossier. It is the responsibility of the division director to provide support for each faculty member in this process of documentation. It is the responsibility of the school director to provide support to division directors in this process. As outlined in the procedures for promotion, the responsibility for

completion of the evaluative portions of the dossier is assigned to the school director by the university, and certain portions of this responsibility are delegated to the division director for faculty in a division.

1. Teaching Evaluation

High quality teaching is expected of every faculty member in the school. The school has a strong commitment to the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students and to clinical education. Documentation should reflect an ongoing, comprehensive, and systematic evaluative process by each faculty member in the school.

With specific teaching goals in mind, evaluation data should reflect the ability of the faculty member to meet the following expectations:

- Command of the course content
- Ability to communicate effectively
- Objectivity and fairness
- Contributions to the development of courses and curricula
- Creativity in course development and classroom strategies
- Mentoring of future professionals
- Contributing to graduate education, including advising graduate students
- Contributing to the continuing education of allied health professionals.

a. Self-Assessment

Within the dossier, each faculty member shall provide a statement of his/her own teaching philosophy and goals. Documentation of teaching objectives, classroom strategies, student outcomes, evaluation of learning, and evaluation of instruction must clearly relate to the faculty member's goals. The faculty member's self-assessment in the dossier should relate to the expectations above and explain how the faculty member has systematically improved his/her teaching.

b. Student Evaluation

All faculty members are required to submit to student evaluation. All didactic and laboratory courses must be evaluated by students, using the university Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). The instrument should be administered and collected by someone other than the faculty member who is being evaluated. Every attempt should be made to maximize response rates.

In addition, teaching should be evaluated by students using open-ended questions or forms that elicit their comments. These forms must be disseminated, collected, collated, and summarized by someone other than the faculty member. Other methods of student evaluation can include mid-course evaluations, student group consensus processes and/or faculty prepared evaluations. Each faculty member is also encouraged to evaluate the quality of his/her contributions to clinical instruction, using consistent forms adopted by the division or school.

Courses such as independent study, practicums, seminars etc. may not be amenable to evaluation using the SEI and, therefore, evaluations are not required for these courses. When alternative evaluation instruments are selected, they should be used consistently. Faculty members who teach courses outside the school should use the standard evaluation form of that teaching unit.

c. *Peer Evaluation*

Systematic peer evaluation of teaching is required. Both probationary and tenured faculty (at all ranks) must have periodic peer evaluation of classroom teaching. Peer evaluations should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot validly assess, such as appropriateness of curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with highest standards of disciplinary knowledge. Literature on the evaluation of instruction suggests that there is no single best instructional method. Peer evaluations should have clear goals and reflect the school's criteria for good teaching. Use of one of the school's two evaluation forms for peer review is recommended. Peer evaluation should include a representative sample of the faculty member's teaching. It includes observation and critique of classroom teaching and external evaluation of teaching materials by experts in the field.

This peer evaluation can be formative or summative. Formative peer evaluation is arranged by the faculty member or the division or school director. The peer evaluator can provide written and verbal feedback to the candidate. The results are used internally by the faculty member for improvement. If the candidate chooses to do so, the formative evaluation can be included in the dossier as an example of the candidate's efforts and interest in improving his/her teaching.

Summative peer evaluation is arranged by the division or school director and results in an evaluative letter placed in the candidate's dossier. For summative peer evaluation, classroom observation should include multiple visits to the classroom, the completion of an evaluation instrument such as that provided on the school's website for faculty council, and a narrative summary of the findings by the evaluator. Summative peer evaluation shall be carried out by a tenured faculty member with a rank equal to higher than that of the faculty member evaluated. The summative report must be submitted to the division or school director.

Whether for formative or summative evaluation, the peer evaluation process should begin with a discussion between the evaluator and the faculty member regarding the teaching goals and plan for the sessions to be observed. Classroom observation should include assessment of student interest and response, as well as the instructor's style, organization, ability to explain complex ideas, interaction, eye contact, body language, content, and synthesis.

Tenure and or promotion candidates should have at least one completed review for every major course they teach. The number of external evaluations of teaching will depend on the number of courses taught, but there must be at least one external evaluation of teaching in the dossier for a probationary faculty member.

2. External Evaluation of Teaching

Each probationary tenure-track faculty member shall also document at least one external evaluation of teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, examinations, and handouts) for one or more courses prior to the sixth-year review. The external evaluation must be arranged, carried out, and received by the division director or school director. The director, in consultation with the candidate, should select colleagues outside of the university who have considerable content expertise. When possible, the peer evaluator should hold a rank equal to or higher than the candidate. Course materials are sent to this individual, and he/she is asked to provide a narrative summary of the quality of the materials and the learning experience as represented by these materials. Consultation for conducting external evaluation of teaching is available from the University Center for Advancement of Teaching. The evaluation summary is returned to the division director or school director, who shares it with the faculty member and submits it to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for inclusion in the dossier. The number of peer evaluations of teaching required of tenured faculty has not been specified; however, peer evaluation of new or significantly revised courses is encouraged.

a. Other Forms of Teaching Evaluation

Faculty members are encouraged to present other forms of evaluative feedback when it helps to clarify and further substantiate teaching quality. Such materials might include, but are not limited to, publications and scholarly presentations related to instructional topics, awards and commendation received by former or current students, teaching materials which have gained national or international recognition, other evidence of national or international reputation in teaching, student outcomes, such as performance on standard tests, evaluations of the quality of advising, evaluative feedback from continuing education programs, and awards for teaching.

3. Research/Scholarship

Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures handbook provides explicit instructions for completion of the research section of the dossier. Candidates must consult the handbook's outline and instructions annually and are advised to NOT use old dossiers as a guideline.

Along with documentation of research and scholarship are required in the core of the dossier, candidates for promotion shall submit a copy of all publications (except abstracts) to the school director's office for verification and evaluation by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Materials accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by the notice of acceptance from the editor or publisher. Items submitted for publication but not yet accepted must be accompanied by confirmation of the submission.

In addition to these items submitted to the school director, the candidate must be prepared to produce proof upon request of any item listed under research and scholarship, for example, abstracts, grants, presentations. The notice of acceptance for abstracts or grant awards from

funding agencies may be inspected by the division or school director or by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty member appointed to verify documentation.

4. Service

Memberships on committees at the local, state, national, and international level are listed in the core of the dossier. The list of university committees should be divided by division, school, college, and university. This list may also include affirmative action and mentoring activities, administrative positions held, and other administrative services. For each committee listed, the candidate indicates in the dossier if membership was appointed, elected, or voluntary. When appropriate, a brief description of the scope of the committee's work is explained. Committee roles, level of participation, and leadership are described. The candidate may describe his/her unique contributions and specific projects and activities accomplished through their own efforts or leadership.

When service constitutes a substantial means by which the candidate satisfies the evaluative criteria, letters may be solicited to assess the candidate's contributions. As with other forms of evaluation, these shall be arranged, carried out, and received by a faculty member other than the candidate (e.g., the division director). Contributions evaluated may include organizing conferences or continuing education, writing proposals, or completing important projects. Internal or external letters can be solicited to evaluate the candidate's contribution to a committee or a project.

The candidate must be prepared to show documentation of all service activities.

VIII. Appeals

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 states:

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

The essence of this rule is that for a faculty member to appeal a decision about promotion to a higher rank, or a decision on tenure or renewal for probationary faculty, the basis of the appeal must be that the decision was not made in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures of the school, college, or university. The text above is found under the section for tenure-track faculty members and is aimed at faculty in that . However, a clinical faculty member can appeal a negative decision for renewal or promotion on similar grounds.

Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 Section (A) on Definitions and Construction states:

- (1) Complaints concerning promotion, tenure, or renewal decisions may be made to the committee on academic freedom and responsibility by any faculty.
- (2) In all formal proceedings under this rule, the burden of going forward and the burden of establishing proof shall be on the complainant.
- (3) "Improper evaluation," as used in this rule, shall mean:
 - (a) That a decision affecting the complainant was based upon an inadequate consideration of the pertinent facts by the individual(s) making the decision, or
 - (b) That such decision was based upon reasons or considerations that infringe a constitutional right of the complainant.
- (4) In considering complaints alleging an improper evaluation under this rule, the review should consider only whether those individual(s) making the decision followed the appropriate procedures, considered the important evidence material to a fair determination, and acted in a responsible manner. When reviewing complaints, neither the committee on academic freedom and responsibility nor the faculty hearing panel shall substitute its judgment on the merits of the individual's performance for that of the academic unit.
- (5) If a complaint is dismissed by either the committee on academic freedom and responsibility or a hearing panel pursuant to this rule, no appeal may be taken by the complainant.
- (6) All records of the proceedings under this rule shall be kept in the office of the executive vice president and provost and shall not be open to public inspection without the written permission of the complainant and the executive vice president and provost.

IX. Seventh-Year Review

Every effort shall be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B), in rare instances where a candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure received a negative decision in the sixth-year review, the school director may petition the dean to conduct a seventh-year review. Both a majority of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the school director must approve the petition, which must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh-year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment.

If the dean concurs with the school director's petition, the dean shall in turn petition the provost for permission to conduct a seventh-year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the non-renewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh-year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

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

X. Appendices

A. Sample Letter Directed to an External Evaluator

The text below is intended for the cover letter to be used as an overall external assessment of a faculty member's impact in consideration of the case for promotion to a higher rank. In the text below, the braces ([]) are used to denote text that should be replaced with the name of the candidate or evaluator, or other information as indicated (the braces themselves should be removed). In cases where two choices are given in braces separated by – or –, (e.g., [A] – or – [B]) choose the appropriate text and omit the alternative. The letter should be printed on school letterhead.

- - - *copy text below here* - - -

[Evaluator name, title, address, phone, and email contact info]

[Date]

Dear [Evaluator],

The School of Health and Rehabilitation Science is considering Dr.[Candidate] for promotion to [new rank]. Dr. [Candidate]'s performance in teaching, [research]– or – [scholarship], and service will be evaluated at the division, school, college and university levels to determine whether [promotion and tenure] – or – [promotion] will granted. I am asking you only to provide a critical assessment of Dr. [Candidate]'s [research] – or – [scholarship].

Enclosed you will find a copy of Dr. [Candidate]'s curriculum vitae and copies of the following papers:

[reference 1]

[reference 2]

[reference 3]

Would you please comment in some detail on the significance of the overall [research] – *or* – [scholarship] program as well as on the individual papers, including the merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study? In addition, please provide your assessment of how Dr. [Candidate]’s [research] – *or* – [scholarship] compares to others in this field at the same stage of career development.

Please do not comment on whether Dr. [Candidate] should be [promoted and tenured] – *or* – [promoted] at Ohio State or would or would not be [promoted and tenured] – *or* – [promoted] at your institution. We must make this assessment based on the total record, not just on [research] – *or* – [scholarship], and on our own criteria and standards.

Under the Ohio Public Records Act, all documents related to promotion and tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. Thus, we cannot promise confidentiality. Thank you for your time and effort in responding to this request. If for any reason you will not be able to evaluate this candidate or if you have any questions about this process, please contact me by email or phone immediately.

I would appreciate receiving your response by [date].

Sincerely,

[School Director signature] [School Director Name and Title, phone, and email contact info]