

B. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

See the [Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, clinical and research faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals

Letters of Offer

http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.ii_lettoffer.html

A draft letter of offer to a faculty candidate must be submitted to the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs of the College of Medicine for review and approval. The draft letter of offer will be reviewed for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, and by the College. Templates for letters of offer are found online on OneSource. Departments should access these templates for each letter written to ensure that they use the approved version.

B. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

1. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy pertaining to tenure-track faculty must be approved in advance by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs. Search procedures must be consistent with the University policies set forth in the most recent update of *A Guide to Effective Searches* <http://hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search as well as other fields within the department.

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the University Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services <http://hr.osu.edu> and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval.

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement is published in one of the discipline's academic journals. Exclusive announcement in electronic media is not sufficient. The University does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U.S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a Tenure-track position included an advertisement in a nationally circulated print journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents its findings to the Department Chair.

On-campus interviews with candidates are arranged by the search committee chair. Interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students or residents, where appropriate; the Department Chair; and the Dean or designee. In addition, it is recommended that all candidates make a presentation to the faculty, students and/or residents on their scholarly activity.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the Search Committee presents its findings and makes its recommendations to the Department Chair or the individual who has commissioned the search, who then proceeds with the offer of an appointment.

If the offer involves senior rank, (Associate Professor or above), the eligible faculty members must also vote on the appointment. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit.

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

B. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

2. CLINICAL FACULTY

Searches for initial appointments in the Clinical should follow the same procedures as those utilized by the Department and the College of Medicine for Tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus interview may be based on clinical/professional practice rather than scholarly activity. A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all clinical positions. Requests for exemption from the national search requirement must be approved by the dean in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in [A Guide to Effective Searches](#).

B. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

3. RESEARCH FACULTY

Searches for initial appointments in the Research should follow the same procedures as those utilized by the Department and the College of Medicine for Tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate is not required to make a presentation during the on-campus interview. Requests for exemption from the national search requirement must be approved by the dean.

B. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

4. ASSOCIATED FACULTY

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the department chair.

Initial appointments to a paid position on the Associated should follow the same procedures as those utilized by the Department and the College of Medicine for Tenure-track faculty, with the exception that a national search is not required.

Appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal is considered at a faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer. No formal search process is required.

Associated appointments are generally made for up to 3 years unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester-by-semester basis.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for faculty (see APPOINTMENT CRITERIA above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the University level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

B. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

5. COURTESY APPOINTMENT FOR FACULTY

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State University department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair must review all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, may take recommendations for nonrenewal from the faculty and must conduct a vote at a meeting. A courtesy faculty appointment forwarded from a Department for approval by the College must have been made consistent with that Department's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by the *Rules of the University Faculty*, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Office of Human Resources.

B. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

6. TRANSFER FROM THE TENURE-TRACK

Transfers between s should be considered the exception rather than the norm and are permitted only under the strict guidelines detailed in the paragraphs below, per University Rules [3335-7-09](#) and [3335-7-10](#). Furthermore, transfer of an individual to a with more limited expectations for scholarship may not be used as mechanism for retaining underperforming faculty members. An engaged, committed, productive and diverse faculty is the ultimate goal of all appointments.

Transfer: Tenure-track to Clinical

If faculty members' activities become more aligned with the criteria for appointment to the Clinical , they may request a transfer. A transfer request must be approved by the Department Chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. The first appointment to the new is probationary; and tenure, or the possibility thereof, is revoked.

Transfer: Tenure-track to Research

If faculty members wish to engage exclusively in research, without the multiple demands required of the tenure-track, they may request a transfer. A transfer request must be approved by the Department Chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. The first appointment to the new is probationary; and tenure, or the possibility thereof, is revoked.

Transfer: Clinical or Research to Tenure-track

Transfer from the Clinical or Research to the Tenure-track is not permitted, but Clinical and Research faculty are eligible to apply for Tenure-track positions through a competitive national search.

IV. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

The Department Chair or his or her designee must conduct an annual review of every faculty member, irrespective of rank, in accordance with University Rule 3335-6-03 (C), and the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook. The only exception to this guideline is that Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal, but continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing academic involvement as described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Volume 1: 2.4.1.6.

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the department's policy on Faculty Duties and Responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-TRACK, CLINICAL , RESEARCH FACULTY, AND FULL-TIME PAID ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Each faculty member must maintain an up to date Research in View profile and/or keep a recent curriculum vitae on record with the Department. The Department Chair will supply each faculty

member with a written evaluation of his or her performance, in narrative format. Annual reviews include an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file. Each department will be responsible for implementing such a plan and describing the annual review procedure in its Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document.

A. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES - PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

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

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

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

A. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES - PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

1. FOURTH YEAR REVIEW

Each faculty member in the fourth year of probationary service must undergo a review utilizing the same process as the review for tenure and promotion, with two exceptions: external letters of evaluation will not be solicited, and review by the College of Medicine Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee is not mandatory. The objective of this review will be to determine if adequate progress towards the achievement of promotion and tenure is being made by the candidate.

When the Department Chair and Dean agree on a positive decision to continue the probationary appointment, review by the College Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee is not required.

If either the Department Chair or the Dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the College Appointment, Promotion and

Tenure Advisory Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

In all cases, the Dean independently evaluates all faculty in their fourth year of probationary appointment and will provide the Department Chair with a written evaluation of the candidate's progress.

A. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES - PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

2. EIGHTH YEAR REVIEW

For faculty members with an 11 year probationary period, an eighth year review, utilizing the same principles and procedures as the fourth year review, will also be conducted.

A. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES: PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

3. EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM PROBATIONARY PERIOD

University guidelines for Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period are specified in University Rule [3335-6-03](#)(D), and are reproduced as follows:

- (a) An untenured tenure- faculty member will have time excluded from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the care giving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six. The Department Chair 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 Department head, Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs in writing before April 1 of the new mandatory review year following granting of the declination. The exclusion of time granted under this provision in no way limits the award of promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory review year (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.
- (b) A probationary tenure- faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful university faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, or service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted to the chair of the Department. Requests will be reviewed by the Department's promotion and tenure committee which will advise the Department Chair regarding their appropriateness. Such

requests require approval by the Department Chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to April 1 of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.

- (c) A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a non-renewal 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.
- (d) 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 Tenure Initiating Unit chair, dean, and executive vice president and provost.
- (e) Tenure- 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.
- (f) 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. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES - TENURED FACULTY

Non-probationary tenure-track faculty members are to be reviewed annually by the Department Chair or his or her designee. A written evaluation in narrative format must be provided and an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting must be scheduled. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

C. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES - CLINICAL FACULTY

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

In the penultimate year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

D. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES - RESEARCH FACULTY

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

In the penultimate year of a research faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

E. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES - ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Associated faculty members are appointed for up to three years and there is no presumption of reappointment. When considering reappointment of associated faculty members, at a minimum, their contribution to the Department must be assessed on an annual basis and documented for the individual's personnel file. This may take the form of self-evaluation. Neither a formal written review nor a meeting is required. The exception to the above is that paid full-time Associated faculty (75% or greater FTE) are required to have a written annual review conducted by the Department Chair or his or her designee. The same procedure used for probationary tenure-track faculty should be used.

V. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

Merit salary increases and other rewards made by a Department must be made consistent with its Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the [College of Medicine](#), (2) the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), (3) the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and (4) the [Office of Human Resources](#). Each Department should include in its Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document a description of the criteria for awarding salary increases, the procedures for making such awards, and the documentation required for this process.

A. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS: CRITERIA

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

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

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

B. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS - PROCEDURES

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

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

C. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS - DOCUMENTATION

Documentation for the purposes of determining merit salary increases will use the same standards as are applied for considerations of promotion and/or tenure.

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the department chair no later than the end of the fiscal year.

- Updated *Curriculum Vitae*, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place.
- Updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline
http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html

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

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

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

Teaching

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.

- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix to this document).
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

Research

- Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g. published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, or grants and contract proposals that have been submitted.

Service

- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A. CRITERIA

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 College of Medicine diversifies and places new emphasis on interdisciplinary endeavors and program development, instances will arise in which the proper work of a faculty member may depart from established academic patterns, especially with regard to awarding tenure. Thus, care must be exercised to apply criteria flexibly, but without compromise in requiring the essential qualifications for promotion. Insistence upon this high standard for faculty is necessary for the maintenance and enhancement of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

Although citizenship and collegiality cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure, these positive attributes characterize the ability of a faculty member to effectively contribute to exemplary scholarship, teaching and service. A commitment to these values and

principles can be demonstrated by constructive responses to and participation in Department, University and College of Medicine initiatives. Examples include participation in faculty governance, outreach and service, ethical behavior, adherence to principles of responsible conduct of research, constructive conduct and behavior during the discharge of duties, responsibilities and authority, and the exercise of rights and privileges of a member of the faculty as reflected in the “Statement of Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors.

Annually, The Ohio State University’s Office of Academic Affairs establishes specific guidelines, procedures, and schedules for the review of candidates for promotion and tenure. The Dean of the College of Medicine also establishes and communicates the latest date for the receipt of dossiers for annual consideration by the College. Upon receipt of a candidate’s dossier, the Dean of the College of Medicine will submit the dossier to the College’s Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee for formal review. The committee will review the dossier, consistent with responsibilities described in Section IX of this document, and convey to the Dean in writing a recommended action to be taken. The Dean will consider the recommendations of the committee and will convey, in writing, a recommended action to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

A. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS - CRITERIA

1. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (TENURE-TRACK)

A. WITH TENURE

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

The awarding of tenure is a prediction of ongoing preeminence and achievement throughout the professional life of the faculty member. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure occurs when a faculty member exhibits clear and sustained evidence of excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated by a national level of significance and recognition of scholarship. In addition, excellence in teaching and outstanding service to The Ohio State University is required, but alone is not sufficient for promotion and awarding of tenure. These three key achievements: scholarship, teaching and service, are individually discussed below.

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

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

The development of a competitive, innovative and distinctive program of scholarship is also evidenced by acquisition of peer-reviewed, nationally competitive extramural support as a principal investigator, multiple investigator, or co-investigator. Similarly, status as principal investigator of a project or a program grant is an acceptable criterion for extramural funding.

Evidence of sustained or multiple grant support is another crucial indicator of expertise in the field. Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure who are without significant clinical responsibilities must have obtained NIH funding as a principal investigator (PI) on an R01 or as one of several program directors or principal investigators on a large NIH grant (multiple-PD/PI) (*i.e.*, multicenter R01 or equivalent such as a project on a P01, U54), or equivalent funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) or have obtained a mid-career K award. They should ideally have demonstrated sustainability of their research program by renewal of the NIH award and/or by garnering a second distinct NIH grant and/or another nationally competitive, peer reviewed grants. The latter may include support from prominent national charitable foundations (*e.g.*, American Heart Association, American Diabetes Association, American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, the March of Dimes, etc.), a major industry grant, or other federal entities such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Defense and the National Science Foundation.

As noted, faculty members are encouraged to collaborate with other investigators and are encouraged to meet the requirement for extramural support for their research as a one of several program directors or principal investigators on network-type or center grants (multiple-PD/PI) or, in some circumstances, by serving as a co-investigator on multiple NIH grants. For clinicians, sustained funding through pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies for investigator initiated proposals is acceptable. Similarly, faculty members who generate support for their research programs through creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies which meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding.

The Department and the College of Medicine acknowledges that there may be situations in which a faculty member develops a productive, nationally renowned program of scholarship without having obtained nationally competitive peer reviewed funding. Such a situation is anticipated to be exceedingly infrequent, however.

The number of publications required for awarding of promotion and tenure should be sufficient to persuasively characterize faculty members' influence in discovery of new knowledge in their fields. Thus, both quality and quantity are important considerations. Publication as first or senior author in the field's highest impact factor journals is an important variable that converges with other factors such as the extent of external funding, invited lectures, invited manuscripts, editorial boards, peer-review panels, and external letters of evaluation in the decision to promote

and award tenure. Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion and tenure decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements while a faculty member at Ohio State University. It should be appreciated that scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive tenure or promotion decision, especially if it occurs in isolation or in the context of poor performance in other areas.

Entrepreneurship is a special form of scholarship valued by the Department and the College of Medicine. Entrepreneurship includes, but may not be limited to, invention disclosures, software development, materials transfers (e.g., novel plasmids, transgenic animals, cell lines, antibodies, and similar reagents), technology commercialization, patent and copyrights, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements. Inasmuch as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, the Department will analyze these flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents will be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenues will be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities will be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion and tenure dossier.

Teaching and Mentoring:

The following will constitute accomplishments characteristic of individuals worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure in the area of teaching:

Teaching (M.D.)

Evidence of persistent commitment to teaching and ongoing development of teaching abilities, as reflected by:

1. Consistently high level evaluations of teaching performance by students, residents, peers.
2. Departmental teaching awards as voted by medical students and/or residents.
3. Demonstrate favorable impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating training, and program or course development.
4. Development of impactful, innovative program that integrate teaching, research and patient care.
5. Participation in the publication of material of an instructional nature or evidence of production of other forms of teaching material (e.g. videotape, computer programs, etc.)
6. Participation in teaching for local, regional and national professional organizations.
7. Participation in the development of educational materials for local, regional and national professional organizations.

(To reach the associate professor level the faculty member is expected to have at least three of these accomplishments, including #1 or #2.)

Teaching (Ph.D.)

Evidence of persistent commitment to teaching and ongoing development of teaching abilities, as reflected by:

1. Evidence of participation in the educational processes within the division, department or college
 - a) course work: organization and oversight of approved academic courses

- lectures provided for approved academic courses
 - b) documented training of individuals or groups in research skills or techniques
 - technicians and laboratory assistants
 - graduate students
 - postdoctoral fellows
 - medical research fellows
 - professional colleagues
 - 2. Evidence of teaching excellence
 - a) consistently high level evaluations of teaching performance by students and peers.
 - b) divisional, departmental or collegiate teaching awards
 - 3. Development of new educational programs for teaching within the institution.
 - 4. Publication of instructional materials (e.g. videotapes, computer programs, etc.).
 - 5. Participation of teaching for local, regional or national organizations.
 - 6. Development of educational materials for local, regional or national organizations.
- (To reach the associate professor level the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishment in #1 and #2, at a minimum.)*

Scholarship and Research (M.D.)

Evidence of ongoing, continuous development of research ability and reputation, as reflected by the following:

1. Multiple publications in peer-reviewed journals (numbers consistent with quantitative standards of department)
2. Publications in prestigious journals, some of which are first-authored.
3. Presentations of scholarly work at local, regional, national or international forums.
4. Funded grant from national sources at monetary levels indicative of major research significance.
5. Development of an area of research or scholarship with growing national recognition.
6. Service on editorial board of journal(s).
7. Publications of book(s).
8. Publication of chapter(s) in books.

(To reach the associate professor level the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishments #1, #2, #4 and #5 at a minimum.)

Scholarship and Research (Ph.D.)

Evidence of ongoing, continuous development of research ability and reputation as reflected by the following:

1. publication in peer-reviewed journals (numbers consistent with quantitative standards of department and scientific discipline).
2. Publication in prestigious journals, identified by objective standards of the scientific discipline.
3. Significant proportion of first author or senior author publications in peer-reviewed journals.
4. Presentation of scholarly work at multiple local, regional, national or international forums.
5. Peer-reviewed research funding from national sources at monetary levels indicative of competitive research significance.
 - a. Primary investigator on at least one grant with significant research support.

- b. Significant contributions of effort as co-investigator on multiple grants may be considered.
 - 6. Development of a growing national reputation for research in one or more areas of importance to the scientific discipline.
 - 7. Service on the editorial board of professional journal(s).
 - 8. Service on grant review boards for local, regional, national or international funding organizations.
 - 9. Retention as consultant by professional or commercial organizations.
 - 10. Publication of books or book chapters.
- (To reach the associate professor level the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishment #1, #4, #5, and #6, at a minimum.)*

Service (M.D.)

The following will constitute accomplishments characteristic of individuals worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure in the area of SERVICE:

- 1. Completion of specialty Board certification.
 - 2. Maintenance of recertification.
 - 3. Evidence of a high-level of clinical competence.
 - 4. Active participation in divisional, Departmental, College and/or University committee functions.
 - 5. Participation in committee activities for local, regional and national organizations.
 - 6. Elected office in local, regional or national professional organizations.
 - 7. Other meritorious community service activities
 - 8. An attitude which reflects professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement of Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors.
 - 9. Maintenance of appropriate licensure and medical staff appointment(s).
 - 10. Participation in the development of new programs for the advancement of medical practice or patient care.
 - 11. Journal editorships, reviewer for journals or other publications.
- (To reach the associate professor level, the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishments #1, #3, #4, #8 and #9 at a minimum.)*

Service (Ph.D.)

Evidence of commitment to the provision of service to the institution, the community or the profession, as reflected by:

- 1. Direction/operation of a service laboratory for division, department, hospital, college, university or professional organization.
- 2. Active participation in divisional, departmental, college or university committee functions.
- 3. Active participation in committee functions for local, regional or national organizations.
- 4. Elected office in local, regional or national professional organizations.
- 5. Other meritorious community service activities.
- 6. An attitude which reflects professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement of Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors.

(To reach the associate professor level the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishments #2 and #6, at a minimum.)

Table 1: Summary of representative metrics used to assess suitability for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure.

For non-clinician faculty and/or clinician faculty below 50% cFTE, NIH funding is required for promotion as listed in the grants category below. For clinician faculty with a cFTE greater than 50%, there should be either evidence of co-investigator status in the grant category listed below as a prerequisite to tenure OR evidence of industry or foundation funding can be accepted.

| Peer-review publications | Grants and Patents | Teaching | Service and National Role |
|--|--|--|--|
| 25-50 in journals with average impact factors of 3-6 or an H-index of 22 or above. As a general guideline 25-35 peer reviewed publications since appointment as an assistant professor at OSU. | PI or multiple-PD/PI on 1 funded R01 (or equivalent) that has been renewed or the combination of a current or prior R01 <u>plus</u> either a) a second R01 <u>or</u> b) an additional funded national grant; <u>or</u> c) patents generating licensing income or evidence of industry or foundation funding* | Teaching awards; positive lecture evaluations from national audience; or K-award mentorship. | University committees plus leadership roles in professional societies and/or multiple <i>Ad hoc</i> or NIH study section membership; and/or service as an <i>ad hoc</i> reviewer or on editorial boards. |

* For clinicians seeking tenure, accommodation should be made for the time devoted to clinical practice as reflected in percent effort or average RVUs/FTE. For example, a 25 to 50% clinical commitment might reduce the required number of publications and H index by 25%. Publication in specialized clinical journals would reduce the impact factor requirement. However, evidence of at least co-investigator status in one of the grant categories listed above is a prerequisite to tenure. For clinicians with a greater than 50% clinical commitment there should be either evidence of co-investigator status in one of the grant categories listed above as a prerequisite to tenure OR evidence of industry and/or foundation funding, a strong publication record (i.e., ≥ 50 peer review publications) coupled with clear evidence of a national reputation for clinical excellence and innovation. Similar accommodations can be made on the basis of educational commitments.

A. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS - CRITERIA

1. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (TENURE-TRACK)

B. WITHOUT TENURE

Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor without Tenure will require a level and pattern of achievement that demonstrates that the candidate is making significant progress toward tenure, but has not yet achieved all the requisite criteria for promotion with tenure. It is expected that promotion to Associate Professor without tenure will be common in the College of Medicine among scholars with clinical roles prior to completion of the 11 year probationary period. A department may propose a faculty member for promotion consideration (without tenure) in cases where a faculty member is making progress but has not achieved the necessary requirements for tenure. In addition faculty committees (at the Department or College) or administrators (Chair or Dean) may determine that a faculty member’s accomplishments do not merit tenure and may

recommend promotion without tenure even if a faculty member has requested promotion with tenure. Promotion without tenure may only occur if a candidate is not in the mandatory review year. If a clinician candidate is promoted without tenure, the tenure review must occur within six years, and no later than the mandatory review year, whichever comes first. **OAA will not support promotion without tenure for faculty with a 6 year probationary period.**

Scholarship: Qualitative indicators consistent with promotion without tenure might include an advancing record of scholarly excellence that demonstrates substantial progress toward meeting the scholarship expectations for the award of tenure. This may be demonstrated by publications in high quality peer-reviewed journals, evidence of emerging external recognition, and progress toward an extramurally supported research program. An example might be clear evidence of escalating productivity late in the interval of probationary status, indicating acquisition of momentum that will propel the candidate toward the sustained record of productivity required for promotion. Publications in journals of lesser impact that reflect the preliminary stages of development of a research career, or a predominance of publications in which the candidate is not first or senior author are also examples. Criteria for a promising trajectory in extramural funding might be reflected by serving as a PI or multiple-PD/PI on a new NIH grant award, as co-investigator on several NIH projects, as PI on local extramural grants, or as local principal investigator for multi-center clinical trials may also meet the requirement of extramural funding (moved from the promotion w/tenure section). Evidence of an emerging national recognition might include invitations to lecture at statewide or regional institutions or scientific meetings. Although the quality of scholarship is of the utmost importance, quantity is also important, and the record of accomplishment must demonstrate discovery of a substantial body of important, new knowledge.

Teaching and Mentoring: Indicators of teaching consistent with promotion without tenure might include a record of teaching excellence involving a single group of trainees, a clear trend of improving teaching evaluations, or departmental teaching awards. Teaching excellence may also be demonstrated through evaluations for presentations at other academic institutions, scientific or professional societies, or other hospitals.

Service: Indicators of service consistent with promotion without tenure might include an insufficient volume of outstanding service; or service as a member or chair of committees within the Department or College, but the absence of significant service roles at the national level. This might also include activities as an ad hoc reviewer for journals, or service on the advisory board for local organizations.

Table 2 below provides a summary of expected benchmarks for promotion to associate professor without tenure.

Table 2: Summary of representative metrics used to assess suitability for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure.

For non-clinician faculty and/or clinician faculty below 50% cFTE, NIH funding is required for promotion as listed in the grants category below. For clinician faculty with a cFTE greater than 50%, there should be either evidence of co-investigator status in the grant category listed below as a prerequisite to tenure OR evidence of industry or foundation funding can be accepted.

| Peer-review publications | Grants and Patents | Teaching | Service and National Role |
|---|---|--|--|
| 10- 25 papers with an average impact factor of 3 to 6 or an H-index of 18 or above. As a general guideline 15-20 peer reviewed publications since their appointment as an assistant professor at OSU. | PI on an R21, R03 or co-investigator on a R01 plus PI status on a major national grant; or PI status on multiple national or Pharma grants; or patent/inventorship; or an unfunded NIH R01 with a score between the 10 th and 18 th percentile for a new investigator, until average pay lines exceed 18 th ile OR evidence of industry or foundation funding* | Teaching awards; and Consistently positive evaluations or positive lecture evaluations from national audience. | University committees plus: Leadership role in professional society or Ad hoc NIH study section membership or committee work for national society. |

*For clinicians seeking promotion without tenure substantial accommodation should be made for the time devoted to clinical practice as reflected in percent effort or average RVUs/FTE. However, for clinicians with 25 to 50% clinical activity evidence of at least co-investigator status in one of the grant categories listed above OR evidence of industry or foundation funding is a prerequisite. For clinicians with > 50% clinical activity a strong publication record (i.e., ≥ 25 peer review publications) with emerging national reputation may be sufficient for promotion. Similar accommodations can be made on the basis of educational commitments.

A. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS - CRITERIA
2. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR (TENURE-TRACK)

Awarding promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure must be based upon clear and unambiguous evidence that the candidate has a sustained, eminent record of achievement recognized nationally and internationally. The general criteria for promotion in scholarship, teaching and service require more advanced and sustained quantity, quality and impact than that required for promotion to associate professor. Importantly, the standard for external reputation is substantially more rigorous than for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. This record of excellence must be evident from activities undertaken and accomplishments achieved since being appointed or promoted to the rank of associate professor.

A sustained record of external funding and an enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an Associate Professor is required for promotion to Professor (see table 3).

Research and Scholarship (M.D.)

The following will constitute accomplishments characteristic of individuals worthy of promotion to professor with tenure in the area of RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP:

1. Multiple publications in peer-reviewed journals (numbers consistent with quantitative standards of department).
2. Publications of major significance in prestigious journals, some of which are first-authored.
3. Presentations of scholarly work at national or international meetings.
4. Multiple funded grants as principal investigator from national sources at levels indicating major research significance OR evidence of industry or foundation funding. Extramural funding since promotion to associate professor is required.
5. National recognition as an expert in a particular area of research or scholarship.
6. Editorship of journal(s).
7. Lead authorship of books.
8. Lead authorship of chapters in books.

(To reach the professor level, the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishment #1 through #5 at a minimum).

Research and Scholarship (Ph.D.)

Evidence of ongoing, continuous development of research ability and reputation, as reflected by the following:

1. Publication in peer-reviewed journals (numbers consistent with quantitative standards of department and scientific discipline).
2. Publications of major scientific significance in prestigious journals, identified by peers using objective standards of the scientific discipline.
3. Significant proportion of first author or senior author publications in peer-reviewed journals.
4. Presentations of scholarly work at multiple local, regional, national or international forums.
5. Multiple awards of peer-reviewed research funding from national sources indicative of competitive research significance.
 - a. Principal investigator of more than one grant with significant research support.
 - b. Significant participation as co-investigator on multiple grants.
 - c. Extramural funding since promotion to associate professor is required
6. Established national or international reputation for research in one or more areas of importance to the scientific discipline.
7. Service on the editorial board of professional journal(s).
8. Service on grant review boards for local, regional, national or international funding organizations.
9. Retention as consultant by professional or commercial organizations.
10. Leadership in publication of books or book chapters.

(To reach the professor level, the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishments #1 through #6, at a minimum).

Teaching and Mentoring:

The following will constitute accomplishments characteristic of individuals worthy of promotion to professor with tenure in the area of TEACHING:

Teaching (M.D.)

1. Consistently high level evaluation of teaching performance by students, residents and peers.
2. Evidence of participation in the educational process within the department or college.
3. College of Medicine teaching awards as voted by medical students and/or residents.

4. Leadership role in the development of new educational programs for teaching students and residents at Ohio State.
5. Leadership role in publication of material of an instructional nature or in production of other forms of teaching material.
6. Development of innovative teaching techniques and vehicles.
7. Leadership role in teaching for local and regional professional organizations. Participation in teaching for national professional organizations.
8. Leadership role in development of educational materials for local and regional professional organizations. Participation in the development of educational materials for national organizations.

(To reach professor level, the faculty member is expected to achieve at least three of these accomplishments, including #1 and #2.)

Teaching (Ph.D.)

Evidence of persistent commitment to teaching excellence and ongoing exercise of teaching abilities, as reflected by:

1. Evidence of participation in the educational processes within the division, department or college
 - a) course work: organization and oversight of approved academic courses/lectures provided for approved academic courses
 - b) documented training of individuals or groups in research skills or techniques such as: technicians and laboratory assistants, graduate students, postdoctoral, fellows, medical research fellows, professional colleagues
2. Evidence of teaching excellence
 - a) consistently high level evaluations of teaching performance by students and peers
 - b) divisional, departmental or collegiate teaching awards
3. Leadership in development of new educational programs for teaching within the institution.
4. Development of innovative teaching techniques or vehicles.
5. Leadership in production of instructional materials (e.g. videotapes, computer programs, etc.).
6. Participation in teaching for local, regional or national organizations.
7. Leadership in development of educational materials for local, regional or national organizations.

(To reach professor level, the faculty member is expected to achieve at least three of these accomplishments, including accomplishments #1 and #2.)

Service

Evidence of ongoing commitment to the provision of service to the institution, the community or the profession, as reflected by:

Service (M.D.)

1. Recognized as a leader in an area of clinical expertise. Director of a service or a section.
2. Chairmanship of Department, College or University committee.
3. Leadership role in committee activities for local, regional and national organizations.
4. Elected office in national professional organization(s).
5. Prominent role in community service activities.

6. Leadership role in the Department.
 7. An attitude which reflects professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement of Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors.
 8. Maintenance of appropriate licensure and medical staff appointment(s).
 9. Leadership role in the development of new programs for clinical care.
- (To reach the professor level, the faculty member is expected to achieve several of these accomplishments including #7 and #8).*

Service (Ph.D.)

Evidence of ongoing commitment to the provision of service to the institution, the community or the profession, as reflected by:

1. Direction/operation of a service laboratory for division, department, hospital, college, university or professional organization.
2. Chairman or divisional, departmental, college or university committee functions.
3. Leadership role in committee functions for local, regional or national organizations.
4. Elected office in local, regional or national professional organizations.
5. Prominent role in meritorious community service activities.
6. Leadership role in the department.
7. An attitude which reflects professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement of Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors.

(To reach the professor level, the faculty member is expected to achieve several of these accomplishments including #7).

Table 3 Summary of representative metrics used to assess suitability for promotion the rank of Professor with tenure.

For non-clinician faculty and/or clinician faculty below 50% cFTE, NIH funding is required for promotion as listed in the grants category below. For clinician faculty with a cFTE greater than 50%, there should be either evidence of co-investigator status in the grant category listed below as a prerequisite to tenure OR evidence of industry or foundation funding can be accepted.

| Peer-review publications | Grants and Patents | Teaching | Service and National Role |
|--|--|--|--|
| 50-70 papers with a mean impact factor of 3 to 6 or an H-index of 25 or more. Ideally there should be 25-35 peer-reviewed journal papers since promotion to associate professor. | Renewed R01 <u>plus</u> a) second significant national grant <u>or</u> b) a second or more simultaneous R01 or equivalent grant (e.g., project on a P01 or U54 project); <u>or</u> c) two or more patents yielding licensing income OR evidence of industry or foundation funding* | Teaching awards; consistently positive teaching evaluations or positive lecture evaluations from national audience; T32 or K-award mentorship. | University committees plus: Leadership role in international society and NIH study section membership or federal panel or committee work; Journal editorial board. |

*For clinicians seeking promotion to professor with tenure, accommodation should be made for the time devoted to clinical practice as reflected in percent effort or average RVUs/FTE. However, for those with 25 to 50% clinical effort evidence of at least co-investigator status in one of the grant categories listed above is a prerequisite to tenure. For clinicians with a greater than 50% clinical commitment there should be either evidence of co-investigator status in one of the grant categories listed above OR evidence of industry or foundation funding, and/or strong publication record coupled with international recognition of clinical excellence. Similar accommodations can be made on the basis of educational commitments.

A. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS - CRITERIA
3. PROMOTION OF CLINICAL FACULTY

Clinical faculty members in general have a greater responsibility for clinical teaching and patient care than individuals in the Tenure-track. Clinical faculty members are not eligible for tenure. The criteria in the categories of teaching and service are, for the most part, very similar to those for the Tenure-track for each faculty rank, although there is greater emphasis on teaching, service and patient care in this , and less emphasis on traditional scholarship.

Clinical Faculty members may continue their service to the Department and the University without ever seeking promotion to the next higher faculty rank, simply through repeated

reappointment at the same level. However, the goals and objectives of the Department, College and University are best served when all faculty members, in all s, strive for continued improvement in all academic areas as measured by meeting or exceeding the requirements for promotion to the next faculty rank.

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Clinical must be based upon convincing evidence that that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition since being appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor. Faculty members on the clinical typically pursue careers as clinician scholars, clinician educators or clinical excellence.

Promotion to Associate Professor - Clinician Educator Pathway

A faculty member must show convincing evidence that he/she has developed a national level of impact and recognition since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor.

Teaching and Mentoring

A distinctive record of teaching and mentoring excellence is required for promotion. Excellence is demonstrated by:

1. Consistently high level evaluations of teaching performance by students, residents, fellows and peers.
2. Departmental teaching awards as voted by medical students and/or residents.
3. Demonstrate favorable impact on teaching and training programs, including curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development.
4. Participation in teaching for local, regional and national professional organizations.
5. Participation in the development of educational materials for local, regional and national professional organizations.
6. Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care.

(To reach the associate professor-clinical level the faculty member is expected to have at least three of these accomplishments, including #1 or #2.)

Service

Evidence of commitment to the provision of service to the institution, the community or the profession, as reflected by:

1. Completion of specialty Board certification.
2. Maintenance of recertification.
3. Evidence of a high-level of clinical competence.
4. Active participation in Departmental, College and/or University committees and affirmative action or mentoring activities.
5. Participation in committee activities for local, regional and national organizations.
6. Elected office in local, regional or national professional organizations.
7. Other meritorious community service activities
8. An attitude which reflects professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement of Professional Ethics" of the American Association of University Professors.
9. Maintenance of appropriate licensure and medical staff appointment(s).

10. Participation in the development of new programs for the advancement of medical practice or patient care

(To reach the associate professor-clinical level, the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishments #1, #3, #4, #8 and #9 at a minimum.)

Scholarship

The specific accomplishments which are to be used to measure suitability for promotion will be the same in the areas of Teaching and Service as are described in the sections on promotion of tenure-track faculty members.

Although there is no expectation of external grant funding for promotion on the Clinical , many faculty members on this will undoubtedly enhance their career and the mission of the Department, University and College of Medicine by acquisition of external funding in support of their program of scholarship.

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor on the Clinical for individuals with heavy clinical responsibility (but without national recognition) must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has demonstrated a level of excellence and a record of impact beyond the usual faculty member's scope or sphere of influence. **Promotion will not be granted purely on the basis of length of service to the institution or satisfactory job performance.**

The following will constitute accomplishments characteristic of individuals worthy of promotion to associate professor in the clinical faculty in the area of Scholarship (these are in addition to the requirements for Teaching and Service as referenced in the previous paragraph):

1. Publications in peer-reviewed journals.
2. Presentations of scholarly work at local, regional, national and international meetings.
3. Development, publication and/or presentation of scholarly work in other formats (e.g., videotapes, CD ROMs, etc.)
4. Evidence that activities or innovations have contributed to a change in the scope and the nature of practice in his or her own discipline.
5. Development of a new and innovate approach to the management of a challenging clinical problem that becomes generalizable and a standard of practice.
6. Referral patterns from beyond the typical distribution for the faculty member's discipline, demonstrating a reputation external to our organization as "best in class".
7. Referral of the most complex and sickest patients, identifying clinical skills beyond peers.
8. Evidence supporting excellence in clinical performance, including clinical measures such as quality indicators, mortality metrics, complication rates, patient satisfaction rates.
9. Contribution to the medical literature and demonstration of knowledge and ability to build on existing literature in relevant domains.
10. Demonstration of dissemination of peer reviewed data and expertise in the form of Grand Rounds, clinical practice guideline, seminars, podcasts, websites, and small group activities with peer reviewed data and internal benchmarking.
11. Demonstration of collaboration with researchers and educators in the Department and beyond.

(To reach the associate professor-clinical level, the faculty member is expected to achieve several of these accomplishments.)

Table 4: Summary of representative metrics used to assess suitability for promotion to Associate Professor in the Clinical -Clinician Educator Pathway.

| Peer-review publications | Grants and Patents | Teaching | Service |
|--|---|---|--|
| As a general guideline, 10-15 peer reviewed publications, scholarly review articles, and/or web based or video teaching modules since being appointed as assistant professor at OSU. | Local leader of at least one nationally-funded or multi-institutional educational project | Excellent Evaluations; Positive lecture evaluations from national audience; Teaching awards | University committees; Committee work in professional organization |

Promotion to Professor – Clinician Educator Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Professor in the Clinical – Clinician-Educator pathway 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 a teacher since being appointed to the rank of Associate Professor.

The general criteria for promotion – scholarship, teaching and service – are the same as those outlined for promotion to the level of Associate Professor as outlined above, except that the indicators are more advanced and sustained in quantity and quality and importantly, impact.

Teaching and Mentoring

Evidence of persistent commitment to teaching excellence and ongoing exercise of teaching abilities, as reflected by:

1. Consistently high level evaluation of teaching performance by students, residents and peers. Evidence for exemplary teaching includes outstanding student and peer evaluations.
2. Evidence of participation in the educational process within the department or college making new, unique and impactful contributions to the teaching mission.
3. College of Medicine teaching awards as voted by medical students and/or residents.
4. Leadership role in the development of new educational programs for teaching students and residents at Ohio State and/or development of teaching methods that are adopted by other institutions.
5. Leadership role in publication of material of an instructional nature or in production of other forms of teaching material.
6. Development of innovative teaching techniques and vehicles.
7. Leadership role in teaching for local and regional professional organizations. Participation in teaching for national professional organizations.

8. Leadership role in development of educational materials for local and regional professional organizations. Participation in the development of educational materials for national organizations.
9. Participation in specialty boards, such as Resident Review Committees, Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, etc.

(To reach professor-clinical level, the faculty member is expected to achieve at least three of these accomplishments, including #1 and #2.)

Mentorship of junior faculty may also demonstrate teaching excellence. It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just ad hoc career coaching. Candidates should evidence mentoring relationships by providing mentees' evaluations.

Service

Evidence of ongoing commitment to the provision of service to the institution, the community or the profession, as reflected by:

1. Recognized as a leader in an area of clinical expertise. Director of a service or a section.
2. Chairmanship of Department, College or University committee.
3. Leadership role in committee activities for local, regional and national organizations.
4. Elected office in national professional organization(s).
5. Prominent role in community service activities.
6. Leadership role in the Department.
7. An attitude which reflects professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement of Professional Ethics" of the American Association of University Professors.
8. Maintenance of appropriate licensure and medical staff appointment(s).
9. Leadership role in the development of new programs for clinical care.

(To reach the professor-clinical level, the faculty member is expected to achieve several of these accomplishments including #7 and #8).

Scholarship and Research

The following will constitute accomplishments characteristic of individuals worthy of promotion to professor in the clinical faculty in the area of research and scholarship:

1. Multiple publications as primary or secondary authorship in peer-reviewed journals.
2. Publications in prestigious journals.
3. Scholarship review articles and case reports.
4. Presentations of scholarly work at national and international meetings.
5. Participation in basic research projects or in clinical trials.
6. Development, publications and/or presentation of scholarly work in other formats (e.g., videotapes, CD-ROMs, etc.) which has gained national recognition.
7. Entrepreneurship and inventorship reflect scholarly activity.

(To reach the professor-clinical level, the faculty member is expected to achieve several of these accomplishments).

Table 5: Summary of representative metrics used to assess suitability for promotion to Professor in the Clinical -Clinician Educator Pathway.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Peer-review publications | Grants and Patents | Teaching | Service |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| As a general guideline 16-30 peer reviewed publications, scholarly review articles, and/or web based or video teaching modules since being promoted to associate professor. | National leader of at least one nationally-funded or multi-institutional educational project | Excellent Evaluations; Positive lecture evaluations from national audience; National teaching awards | Leadership role in College or University committees; Leadership role in national professional organization |
|---|--|--|--|

Promotion to Associate Professor - Clinician Scholar Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Clinical – Clinician-Scholar pathway must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition as a clinician scientist since being appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor (see Table 6).

Teaching and Mentoring: A distinctive record of teaching and mentoring excellence is required for promotion. Excellence is demonstrated by positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and national peers. Teaching awards and other honors are also supportive of teaching excellence. Teaching excellence must be demonstrated through evaluations and peer feedback based on presentations at other academic institutions, presentations or tutorials at scientific conferences or meetings, presentations at other medical centers or hospitals, and the like. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards and other such mentored programs is very highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

Scholarship: The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship as reflected by primary or senior authorship of peer-reviewed journal publications, scholarly review articles and case reports, and participation in basic, translational or clinical research projects or in clinical trials. For example, 25 peer review publications in journals with an average impact factor of 2.5 or 15 publications in journals with an average impact factor of 4 would satisfy this threshold. The recognition of the publication by peers can be adjudged by calculation of the H-index. Here 15 publications cited at least 15 times would be a reasonable minimum threshold. Again, participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued even though it may result in “middle” authorship, as long as the faculty member’s unique contribution can be discerned. Faculty on this should have acquired external funding in support of their program of scholarship. Candidates should have a record of being investigators in foundation, industry or NIH studies. Entrepreneurship and inventorship are also evidence of scholarly activity, as described in Section VI.A.1.a [Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure] above, and will be viewed most favorably.

Service: Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, exemplary patient care, program development relating to clinical, administrative, leadership and related

activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Evidence of service can include membership on department, COM, hospital, and/or University committees and mentoring activities.

Table 6: Summary of representative metrics used to assess suitability for promotion to Associate Professor in the Clinical -Clinician Scholar Pathway.

| Peer-review publications | Grants and Patents | Teaching | Service |
|--|--|--|--|
| 25 x mean impact factor of 2.5; 15 x mean impact factor of 4 or H-index of 15. As a general guideline 15-25 peer reviewed publications since being appointed as an assistant professor at OSU. | Participation on at least one clinical trial or other nationally funded grant. | Excellent Evaluations; Positive lecture evaluations from national audience | University committees; Committee work in professional organization |

Promotion to Professor - Clinician Scholar Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Professor in the Clinical – Clinician-Scholar pathway must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that that the candidate has developed a national level of recognition as a clinician scientist since being appointed to the rank of Associate Professor (see Table 7).

Teaching and Mentoring: A record of teaching excellence as an Associate Professor must continue to justify promotion to the rank of Professor. The faculty member should have made unique and impactful contributions to the teaching mission as an Associate Professor. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards and other such mentored programs is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

Mentorship of junior faculty may also demonstrate teaching excellence. It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just ad hoc career coaching. Candidates should evidence mentoring relationships by providing mentees’ evaluations.

Service: Promotion to the rank of Professor requires service with distinction to the College of Medicine, OSU, or in a national context. The faculty member should have made new and impactful service contributions as an Associate Professor. Candidates should have led the development of new and innovative clinical or clinical research programs which received national recognition and participated in leadership positions of learned academic education professional societies.

Scholarship: The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship as reflected by primary or senior authorship of peer-reviewed journal publications, scholarly review articles and case reports, and participation in basic, translational or clinical research projects or in clinical trials. For example, 40 peer review publications in journals with an average impact factor of 2.5 or 25 publications in journals with an average impact factor of 4 would satisfy this threshold. The recognition of the publication by peers can be adjudged by calculation of the H-index. Here 18 publications cited at least 18 times each would be a reasonable minimum threshold. Faculty

members on this should ideally have been co-investigators on multiple NIH, Pharma, or major national clinical trials. Entrepreneurship and inventorship are also evidence of scholarly activity, as described in Section VI.A. and will be viewed most favorably.

Table 7: Summary of representative metrics used to assess suitability for promotion to Professor in the Clinical -Clinician Scholar Pathway.

| Peer-review publications | Grants and Patents | Teaching | Service |
|--|--|---|--|
| 40 x mean impact factor of 2.5; or 25 x mean impact factor of 4 or H-index of 18. As a general guideline 15-25 peer reviewed publications since being promoted to associate professor. | PI, or multiple-PD/PI on a major national peer reviewed grant <u>or</u> co-investigator status clinical trials or other national grants; or patents; or national reputation for clinical innovation. | Excellent Evaluations; Positive lecture evaluations from national audience; T32 or K award mentor | University committees; Leadership role in national professional organization |

Service: Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, exemplary patient care, program development relating to clinical, administrative, leadership and related activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Evidence of service can include membership on Department, COM, hospital, and/or University committees and affirmative action or mentoring activities.

PROMOTION, CLINICAL EXCELLENCE PATHWAY

In the circumstance where individuals are assigned major responsibilities (90% time or greater) for clinical care and clinical administrative activities, faculty members may seek promotion for excellence in activities categorized as “scholarship of practice” (or “scholarship of application”). The clinical time commitment of these individuals may not allow the achievement of personal national recognition for their accomplishments; however, their unique contributions serve to enhance the national recognition of the Medical Center or their assigned hospital. For these individuals, their contribution to the regional and national recognition of the Medical Center may serve as a proxy for individual national recognition.

Metrics should include consistent rankings among the Nation’s elite in the Castle-Connolly or U.S. News Physicians Survey, or similar (Best Doctors, Inc). At a minimum they should demonstrate:

- a) Referral patterns from beyond the typical distribution (demonstrates a reputation external to our organization as “best in class”).

- b) Referral of the most complex and sickest patients (identifies those physicians with clinical skills beyond their peers).
- c) Multiple lines of evidence supporting excellence in clinical performance, including clinical measures such as quality indicators, mortality metrics, complication rates, and patient satisfaction rates where performance measures can easily be internally and externally benchmarked for comparison.
- d) Establishment of quality improvements or systems-based changes that result in enhancement of the care provided to OSU Medical Center patients.
- e) A sustained record of exemplary clinical leadership and unique program development within the institution.
- f) Demonstration of dissemination of peer reviewed data and expertise in the form of Grand Rounds, clinical practice guidelines, seminars, podcasts, websites, small group activities with peer reviewed data and internal benchmarking.
- g) Demonstration of collaboration with researchers and educators in the Department and beyond.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, CLINICAL EXCELLENCE PATHWAY

Patient care and the scholarship of practice are the overwhelming areas of emphasis for these individuals. The awarding of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Clinical Excellence Pathway for individuals with heavy clinical responsibilities (but without national recognition) must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has demonstrated a level of excellence and a record of impact beyond the usual faculty member's scope or sphere of influence. Promotion will not be granted purely on the basis of length of service to the institution or satisfactory job performance.

Scholarship of Practice

Examples as follows:

- Evidence that activities or innovations of an individual faculty member have contributed to a change in the scope and the nature of practice
- The development of new and innovative approaches to the clinical management of challenging clinical problems.

PROFESSOR, CLINICAL EXCELLENCE PATHWAY

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Professor in the Clinical Excellence Pathway must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that that the candidate's work has developed a national impact and recognition for clinical excellence and innovation since being appointed to the rank of Associate Professor.

Examples as follows:

- Consistent rankings among the Nation's elite in the Castle and Connelly or U.S. News Physicians Survey or similar (Best Doctors, Inc)
- Receiving patient referrals from throughout the United States
- National awards for clinical excellence and innovation

A. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

5. PROMOTION OF RESEARCH FACULTY

In the Research , 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.

Promotion to Associate Professor on the Research

Scholarship and Research:

Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in one's field of endeavor.

Evidence of ongoing, continuous development of scholarship/research ability and reputation as reflected by the following:

1. publication in peer-reviewed journals (numbers consistent with quantitative standards of department and scientific discipline).
2. Publication in prestigious journals, identified by objective standards of the scientific discipline.
3. Significant proportion of first author or senior author publications in peer-reviewed journals.
4. Presentation of scholarly work at multiple local, regional, national or international forums.
5. Peer-reviewed research funding from national sources at monetary levels indicative of competitive research significance.
 - a. Primary investigator on at least one grant with significant research support.
 - b. Significant contributions of effort as co-investigator on multiple grants may be considered.
6. Development of a growing national reputation for research in one or more areas of importance to the scientific discipline.
7. Service on the editorial board of professional journal(s).
8. Service on grant review boards for local, regional, national or international funding organizations.
9. Retention as consultant by professional or commercial organizations.
10. Publication of books or book chapters.
11. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science.
12. Entrepreneurship including invention disclosures, software development, materials transfers, technology commercialization, patent and copyrights.

(To reach the research associate professor level the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishment #1, #4, #5, and #6, at a minimum.)

Although funding by the National Institutes of Health is highly desirable, it is not required for promotion. Other nationally competitive, peer reviewed funding, including support from national charitable foundations (e.g. American Heart Association or American Cancer Society), industry, or federal entities such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Science Foundation will satisfy the criterion for nationally competitive peer reviewed funding should evidence exist for a sustained record of funding from these types of agencies. Faculty

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

For promotion to Professor on the Research Professor:

A faculty member must have a national and international reputation built on an extensive body of high quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A sustained record of external funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

Scholarship:

Evidence of ongoing, continuous development of scholarship/research ability and reputation, as reflected by the following:

1. Publication in peer-reviewed journals (numbers consistent with quantitative standards of department and scientific discipline).
2. Publications of major scientific significance in prestigious journals, identified by peers using objective standards of the scientific discipline.
3. Significant proportion of first author or senior author publications in peer-reviewed journals.
4. Presentations of scholarly work at multiple local, regional, national or international forums.
5. Multiple awards of peer-reviewed research funding from national sources indicative of competitive research significance.
 - a. Principal investigator of more than one grant with significant research support.
 - b. Significant participation as co-investigator on multiple grants.
 - c. Extramural funding since promotion to associate professor is required
6. Clearly established national or international reputation for research in one or more areas of importance to the scientific discipline.
7. Service on the editorial board of professional journal(s).
8. Election or appointment to a national office, service as a national committee or task force chair.
9. Expectation to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support research program.
10. Service on grant review boards for local, regional, national or international funding organizations.
11. Retention as consultant by professional or commercial organizations.
12. Leadership in publication of books or book chapters.

(To reach the research professor level, the faculty member is expected to achieve accomplishments #1 through #6, at a minimum).

Extramural funding as principal investigator is preferred but not required.

A. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

5. PROMOTION OF ASSOCIATED FACULTY

By definition, Associated Faculty members focus on a specific aspect of the department mission. Accordingly, their promotion is based on performance in a particular role. In general, they must demonstrate excellence and innovation in their focus area.

Promotion to Associate Professor on the Associated.

Teaching and Mentoring: For faculty members whose principal focus is teaching and mentoring, benchmarks for promotion include sustained excellence in reviews by students and residents supervised by the faculty member, teaching awards, introduction of students to new modes of practice or patient populations not previously available to learners, participation or leadership in curriculum development.

Scholarship: For faculty members whose principal focus is scholarship, benchmarks include participation in research projects, programs, or other scholarly activity that result in enhanced regional recognition of the Department and the College through publications, funded programs, or other means. Presentations at regional meetings or leadership or participation in regional organizations dedicated to the faculty member's area of focused scholarship serve as further indicators of advancement to this rank. Although a record of publication is not an expectation in the Associated, publications or other forms of dissemination of scholarship (e.g. web based documents, other electronic media) are valued and contribute to advancement in rank. This is particularly true for faculty who are appointed based on their collaboration in research or other scholarly activities. Publications may be of diverse types and are not required to be first or senior authored.

Leadership and Administration: For faculty members whose principal focus is service, benchmarks may include the faculty member's membership and participation on committees or other leadership groups. Significant contributions through membership on committees contributing to the growth in excellence of the Department which have made fundamental and innovative changes in Department or College procedures, practice or culture constitute significant benchmarks. Leadership of subgroups within a committee, such as a writing group, or supervision of a task force are other examples of benchmarks. There must be a sustained commitment to leadership and administration rather than a single interaction with a Department/College committee or leadership group.

Patient Care: For faculty members whose principal focus is patient care, excellence in patient care is demonstrated by recognition such as regional and national Best Doctors listings or other recognition of excellence in patient care. Innovative approaches to patient care or introduction of new patient populations to those currently served by the faculty of the College of Medicine constitute a further benchmark. Patterns of patient referral from outside the institution, owing to recognized expertise, serve as a benchmark where appropriate as well as invitations to speak at local or regional meetings or outside institutions. A fundamental metric is whether the faculty member has changed the practice of neurosurgery through the innovations referred to above.

Promotion to Professor on the Associated

Promotion to the rank of Professor in the Associated is based not only on sustained contributions in the faculty member's area of focus but on a more advanced stage of leadership or greater sphere of impact than that of an Associate Professor.

Teaching and Mentoring. For faculty members whose principal focus is teaching and mentoring, faculty promoted to the rank of Professor will not only have the accomplishments of an Associate Professor but will also attain broader recognition for contributions through curriculum development and recognition of excellence in education. This may come in the form of regional and national teaching awards, membership and leadership in national organizations and meetings dedicated to medical education, adoption of teaching innovations and curricula introduced by the faculty member to institutions outside the Department and College of Medicine, and invitations to speak at outside institutions. Although publications are not an expectation, publications or web sites conveying the faculty member's innovations will serve as an indication for dissemination of innovation outside the Department and College.

Scholarship: For faculty members whose principal focus is scholarship, the scholarly contributions of Associated faculty promoted to the rank of Professor will exceed the scope of those at the rank of Associate Professor. Benchmarks include participation in research projects, programs, or other scholarly activities that result in enhanced national recognition of the Department and College through publications, funded programs, or other means. Authorship or co-authorship of manuscripts and participation in nationally funded programs of research are examples of benchmarks for those achieving this rank. Presentations at national meetings and membership or leadership in national organizations dedicated to the faculty member's focus of scholarship are further benchmarks.

Leadership and Administration: For faculty members whose principal focus is service, the faculty member advancing to the rank of Professor will progress to senior leadership roles in the Department or College of Medicine. This may consist of serving as chair of committees that contribute to the growth in excellence of the Department or which have made fundamental and innovative changes in Department procedures, practice or culture. There must be a record of sustained senior leadership rather than a single interaction with a College committee or leadership group.

Patient Care: For faculty members whose principal focus is patient care, excellence in patient care extending outside the institution is expected as demonstrated by national Best Doctors listings or other recognition of excellence in patient career. Evidence of wide referral of patients from outside the institution may serve as an indicator of recognized patient care excellence and expertise where appropriate. Other benchmarks include innovative approaches to patient care or introduction of new patient populations that are adopted or have influence outside the Department and College of Medicine. Invitations to speak at outside institutions or consult with national organizations regarding the faculty member's patient care expertise are further indicators of recognized expertise for this rank. In contrast to Associate Professor, a fundamental metric is whether the faculty member has changed the practice in his or her field such that it has impact outside the Department and College of Medicine.

B. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS - PROCEDURES

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty s in the department.

CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES

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

If external evaluations are required: to review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.)

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

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

Review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A simple majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured or non-probationary faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

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

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.

 - **Summer:** Gather internal evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service from students and peers, as appropriate, within the department.

 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

Establish the meeting(s) of the eligible faculty.
 - To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.

 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.

Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

The department chair, college dean, college associate and assistant deans, provost, and president may not be members of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The department chair may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

ELIGIBLE FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

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

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

DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

Verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a nonmandatory review for tenure, and tenure may not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

In late Spring Semester, the Department Chair will solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Chair, and the candidate.

To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any department with which the candidate has a joint appointment.

To remove any member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. A conflict of interest exists when a Promotion and Tenure Committee member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:

- of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
- of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
- of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier.
- to provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.

To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.

To write an evaluation and recommendation to the department chair of a tenure initiating unit recommending promotion for a joint appointee by the date requested.

EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

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

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from full professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

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

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

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

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

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

DOCUMENTATION

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

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

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

In considering the Department's recommendation for promotion and tenure, or for promotion alone, the College's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate candidates based upon both the College's document and the Department's document (which must meet or exceed the minimum requirements of the College's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document). The College Committee will make a recommendation to the Dean based upon the qualifications and performance of the candidate and considering national expectations for that particular discipline. In circumstances in which the guidelines of the Department and the College are not congruent, the more stringent requirements (either those of the College or the Department) will be the standards which guide the College Committee's assessment and judgment.

Teaching

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

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

For the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less:

- Student evaluations of faculty members will be done at the conclusion of each course or educational exercise. These could include individual lecture or course evaluations, and department solicited evaluations of former students. For the basic medical student clerkship, standard evaluation forms developed by the Department Education committee must be used. Someone other than the faculty member being evaluated must obtain evaluations from students in order to assure credibility of the evaluation process. Student evaluations are required.
- MedStar Evaluations
- Resident evaluations of faculty members are required. These will be done on a basis (at least annually) with results shared with the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's departmental file. Resident evaluations are required.
- Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members. Peer evaluations may include internal, and/or external review of classroom instruction, clinical teaching and course materials such as syllabi, examinations and instructional materials including textbooks. Assessment by observation of classroom and clinical teaching is most useful

when done systematically over time and conducted with the specific goal of offering constructive suggestions.

- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Candidate's self-evaluation: could include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching; self-assessment; and description of specific strategies for improvement - past, current, planned.
- Other: could include the success rate of trainees in in-training examinations and in passage of specialty board examinations; success of the candidate's former graduate and post-doctoral students; extent to which pedagogical materials developed by the candidate have been adopted by other faculty here and at other institutions; extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching; teaching awards and national recognition awards.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate. This may include an administrator's assessment of the candidate's teaching load, contribution to the teaching mission of the academic unit, and contribution to curriculum development. Evidence of the success of the candidate's former students including professional and graduate students and post-doctoral trainees should be documented.

Scholarship/Research

Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge by research, study and learning. In the College of Medicine, a faculty member's scholarship must be demonstrated to be of high quality, significance and impact. All Department faculty members must develop a record of scholarship that is documented by a body of original scholarly work over a period of time. The evidence for scholarship must refer to original, substantive works that are documented achievements. Recognition of scholar work must also be external to the University, residing in regional, national and/or international intellectual and scientific communities. Evidence of Scholarship/Research may include the following:

- Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication to include peer reviewed journal articles, bulletins and technical reports, original books and monographs, edited books, chapters in edited books, editor reviewed journal articles, reviews and abstracts, etc. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received. May include externally funded research, funded training grants, other funding for academic work, prizes and awards for research or scholarly or creative work, major professional awards and commendations.

- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate e.g. published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, or grants and contract proposals that have been submitted.
- Invited lectures at other universities, symposia and conferences.
- Invention disclosures, patent activity, entrepreneurship, technology commercialization, software development.
- Editorship of a major collection of research work, leadership of advanced seminars, invitations to serve on national review bodies.

Service

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the Department, exemplary patient care, professional service to neurosurgery and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University.

Evidence of service in the past 5 years or since the last promotion may include:

- Administrative work for the department, college or university; clinical service in the care of patients, service to the profession such as leadership roles and editorial and reviewing activities; and applications of professional expertise in service to the community. Local, regional and national recognition for expert service may be evidenced by awards and citations from external organizations.
- Election or appointment to leadership roles in regional and national organizations may serve as an indicator of the quality of service, and can provide evidence that the candidate's services are sought after rather than volunteered. Depending on the nature of a candidate's service activities, it may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those who are in a position to evaluate specific contributions (e.g., the President of a national professional organization).
- Development of innovative programs, professional consult to industry, government and education, a panel and commission participant

APPEALS

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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

Faculty members in the Department of Neurological Surgery who wish to appeal a nonrenewal decision, a negative promotion and tenure decision, or any other aspect of their evaluation must do so in writing within one month of receipt of notification of the decision. The appeal should be based upon the faculty member's contention that the Department did not properly apply its own policies and standards in reaching its decision. The appeal letter must reference the policies and standards in question and provide the faculty member's evidence for disputing the original decision by the Department Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (AP&T) Committee.

The appeal letter shall be directed to the AP&T Committee which must conduct a meeting to review the appeal within two weeks of receipt of the letter. The faculty member shall be invited to be present at and participate in the review session.

If the AP&T Committee does not agree, by majority vote, that improper evaluation has occurred, the faculty member may appeal directly to the Department Chair who shall conduct his/her own review of the allegations. The appeal to the Chair must be heard within two weeks, with the faculty member in attendance at and participating in the review session. If the AP&T Committee or the Department Chair agree with the faculty member that the evaluation was done improperly and that those actions that were improper were substantive, then steps will be taken to correct the review process. Prior to reinstating the review process, the Department will consult with the College and the Office of Academic Affairs to insure compliance with all guidelines.

REVIEWS IN THE FINAL YEAR OF PROBATION

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05 \(B\)](#) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a review in the final year of probation.

In most instances, a decision to deny promotion and tenure in the penultimate probationary year (11th year for faculty members with clinical responsibilities, 6th year for those without clinical responsibilities) is considered final. However, in rare instances in which there is substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is relevant to the reasons for the original negative decision, a seventh (or twelfth) year review may be conducted. The request for this review must come from the eligible faculty and the head of the Department, and may not come from the faculty member himself/herself.

If a terminal year review is conducted by the Department and the College, it will be made consistent with the Department's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, the College's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, and other relevant policies, procedures,

practices, and standards established by: (1) the College, (2) the *Rules of the University Faculty*, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, including the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

APPENDICES

A. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty should choose a day late in the quarter when attendance is likely to be high to distribute the form. A Graduate Teaching Associate, staff member, or other faculty member should administer the evaluation forms to the class and return them to the Office of the University Registrar as instructed. This individual should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

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

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

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track, clinical faculty, at least once per quarter during the first two years of service, and at least twice per year during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year.
- To review the teaching of tenured Associate Professors and clinical faculty at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three year period.
- To review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary clinical professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.
- To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review.

scheduled peer teaching evaluation (i.e. the first three situations listed above) is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Classroom visitation is conducted by two or more committee members attending together and is unannounced. However, at the beginning of the quarter, the Committee will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because exams are being given, guest speakers are scheduled, etc.

Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (e.g., survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

As part of its evaluation the Committee examines copies of the faculty member's SEI summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the Committee attempts to ascertain the reasons. In so doing, members are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the quarter, and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

scheduled reviews are both summative and formative, i.e. they provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews, and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching.

Note: the effectiveness of the peer teaching evaluation procedures outlined above would be strengthened if the department developed worksheets for use in evaluating the various aspects of instruction. The Office of Faculty and TA Development <http://ftad.osu.edu> offers assistance in such endeavors.

B. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Adjunct Faculty – 0% FTE, non-salaried, non-clinical associated faculty that participate in the education and training of graduate and medical students. (see also **Associated Faculty**). An adjunct appointment is not the same as a **Courtesy Appointment**.

APT – Appointments, Promotion and Tenure

Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee – the body of faculty that make recommendations to the Department Chair or Dean regarding the viability of candidates for appointment, promotion and/or tenure.

Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Document – a document required of every Department and College that describes the guidelines that must be used for making appointments, and for faculty to achieve promotion and tenure.

Associated – faculty that are not considered “.” Positions may be paid or unpaid. These faculty fall into many sub-categories. (See also Clinical Associated Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, full-time Paid Associated)

Clinical Associated Faculty – 0% FTE community physicians that participate in the education and training of medical students and residents. (see also **Full-time Paid Associated Faculty**)

Courtesy Appointment – a no salary associated appointment for a faculty member from another academic department within the University. The title associated with the no salary appointment is always the same as the position.

Dossier – a document compiled by a promotion and/or tenure candidate to demonstrate achievement.

Eligible faculty – the faculty who are authorized vote on appointment, promotion and tenure matters. These faculty must be above the candidate’s rank. Clinical and Research faculty may not vote on faculty.

Exclusion of Time – the ability to have up to three years taken off the time clock toward achieving tenure

Faculty s – the College of Medicine has four: Tenure-track, Clinical , Research , Associated (see also **Faculty**)

FTE – Full-time equivalent, the percentage of time worked expressed as a decimal. Full-time is 1.0, half-time is .5, and quarter-time is .25.

Full-time Paid Associated Faculty – 50-100% FTE physicians working within (and being paid solely by) the OSU Health System or the Faculty Group Practice. (see also **Clinical Associated Faculty**)

Joint Appointment – when a faculty member’s FTE (and salary support) is split between one or more academic departments it is considered to be a joint appointment. (see also **Courtesy Appointment**)

Mandatory review – a required 4th year, 8th year, tenure review, or reappointment review

MOU – Memorandum of Understanding – a document between two academic departments expressing how a faculty member’s appointment, time, salary and other resources will be allocated and/or divided. (Used during transfer of TIU and for joint appointments.)

Non-mandatory review – voluntary promotion or tenure review

OAA – Office of Academic Affairs

Peer Review – evaluation of teaching by colleagues. Documentation of peer review is required for the promotion and tenure dossier.

Penultimate year – the next to last year of a contract, used to determine required clinical and research review dates

Prior Service Credit – Application of years of service at the University in one or rank applied to another or rank when a faculty member transfers or is promoted. Prior service credit is not allowed for transfers; it is automatic for promotions unless turned down. For probationary Tenure-track appointments, prior service credit shortens the length of time that a faculty member has to achieve tenure by the amount of the credit.

Probationary period – the length of time in which a faculty member on the Tenure-track has to achieve tenure (6 years for faculty without clinical service, 11 years for faculty with clinical service). It is also defined as the first contract for faculty on the Clinical or Research .

Reappointment Review – the review of a Clinical faculty member in the penultimate year of their contract to determine if the contract will be renewed.

Faculty – anyone holding a faculty position 50% FTE or greater in one of the three faculties in the College of Medicine.

Clinical – the faculty for physicians who primarily engage in clinical teaching and practice.

Research – the faculty for basic scientists who engage exclusively in research-based scholarship.

Tenure-track – the faculty for basic scientists and physicians with a major focus of research-based scholarship.

Research in View – the University’s online dossier and CV creation tool (see <https://osu.researchinview.thomsonreuters.com/>)

SEI – Student Evaluation of Instruction

Tenure – permanent employment status only granted to faculty on the Tenure-track when the probationary period is successfully completed

TIU – Tenure Initiating Unit, usually synonymous with Department. Centers and Institutes are not Tenure Initiating Units (please see Appendix B of the College’s AP&T document for the complete list of TIUs)

University Rules – or *Rules of the University Faculty* – The section of the Ohio Revised Code that prescribes the rules and governance of The Ohio State University and its employees.

C. AAUP STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

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

responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

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

REVISED: 04/01/14