

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
FOR APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, TENURE AND MERIT PAY RAISES
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACOLOGY
The Ohio State University College of Medicine

APR 7 2006

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

January 2006

Table of Contents
Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Document
Department of Pharmacology

1. Preamble	1
1.1 General Considerations	1
1.2 Other Considerations	2
2. Department Mission	2
3. Appointments	2
3.1 Tenure Track Faculty Appointments	3
3.1.1 General Considerations	3
3.1.2 Tenure Track Assistant Professor	4
3.1.3 Associate Professor with Tenure	5
3.1.4 Professor with Tenure	5
3.1.5 Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure	5
3.1.6 Instructor	6
3.2 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	7
3.3 Research Faculty Track.....	7
3.3.1.....	7
3.3.2.....	8
3.3.3.....	9
3.3.4.....	10
3.4 Auxiliary Faculty.....	10
3.5 Emeritus Faculty	11
4. Procedures for Appointment	11
4.1 Tenure Track Faculty	11
4.1.1 Assistant Professors	12
4.1.2 Associate Professors and Professors	12
4.1.3 Courtesy	13
4.1.4 Auxiliary Faculty	13
4.1.5 Emeritus Faculty	14
4.2 Research Track Faculty.....	14
4.2.1.....	14
4.2.2.....	15
5. Annual Reviews	15
5.1 Probationary Faculty	16
5.1.1 Exclusion of Time From the Probationary Period	18
5.2 Procedures: Tenured Faculty	18
5.3 Regular Research Faculty.....	19
6. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	19
6.1 Criteria	19
6.1.1 Research	20

6.1.2	Teaching	20
6.1.3	Service	21
6.2	Procedures	21
6.3	Documentation	21
6.3.1	Scholarly Activity	22
6.3.1.1	Research Grants and Contracts	22
6.3.1.2	Publications.....	22
6.3.1.3	Patents	22
6.3.2	Teaching	22
6.3.2.1	Medical and Professional Education	22
6.3.2.2	Graduate Teaching and Training	22
6.3.2.3	Undergraduate Education and Training	22
6.3.2.4	Other	23
6.3.3	Service	23
6.4	Equity-Excellence Salary Adjustments	23
7.	Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion	23
7.1	Probationary Period.....	23
7.2	Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure	24
7.3	Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Professor	24
7.4	Promotion and Reappointment Regular Research Faculty.....	25
7.4.1	Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Research Associate Professor.....	26
7.4.2	Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Research Professor.....	26
7.5	Criteria: Promotion of Auxiliary Faculty.....	27
7.6	Procedures: Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	27
7.6.1	Check List	27
7.6.2	Procedural Oversight Designee	27
7.6.3	Conflict of Interest	27
7.6.4	Letters of Evaluation	28
7.6.4.1	External Letters	28
7.6.4.2	AP&TC Letter	28
7.6.4.3	Chair's Letter	29
7.6.4.4	Other Letters	29
7.6.5	Publications	29
7.6.6	Other Research Activities	29
7.6.7	Evaluation of Teaching	30
7.6.7.1	Quality of Teaching	30
7.6.7.1.1	Student Evaluations	30
7.6.7.1.2	Peer Evaluations	30
7.6.7.2	Other Teaching Considerations	30
7.6.8	Evaluation of Service	30
7.6.9	Other Service Activities	31
7.7	Procedures: Promotion to Professor	31
7.7.1	Check List	31
7.7.2	Procedural Oversight Designee	31
7.7.3	Conflict of Interest	32

7.7.4	Letters of Evaluation	32
	7.7.4.1 External Letters	32
	7.7.4.2 AP&TC Letter	33
	7.7.4.3 Chair's Letter	33
	7.7.4.4 Other Letters	33
7.7.5	Publications	33
7.7.6	Other Research Activities	34
7.7.7	Evaluation of Teaching	34
	7.7.7.1 Quality of Teaching	34
	7.7.7.1.1 Student Evaluations	34
	7.7.7.1.2 Peer Evaluations	34
	7.7.7.2 Other Teaching Considerations	34
7.7.8	Evaluation of Service	35
7.8	Procedures: Promotion to Research Associate Professor.....	35
7.8.1	Check List	35
7.8.2	Procedural Oversight Designee	35
7.8.3	Conflict of Interest	36
7.8.4	Letters of Evaluation	36
	7.8.4.1 External Letters	36
	7.8.4.2 AP&TC Letter	37
	7.8.4.3 Chair's Letter	37
	7.8.4.4 Other Letters	37
7.8.5	Publications	37
7.8.6	Other Research Activities	37
7.8.7	Evaluation of Service	38
7.8.8	Other Service Activities	38
7.9	Procedures: Promotion to Research Professor.....	38
7.9.1	Check List	39
7.9.2	Procedural Oversight Designee	39
7.9.3	Conflict of Interest	39
7.9.4	Letters of Evaluation	39
	7.9.4.1 External Letters	39
	7.9.4.2 AP&TC Letter	40
	7.9.4.3 Chair's Letter	40
	7.9.4.4 Other Letters	40
7.9.5	Publications	41
7.9.6	Other Research Activities	41
7.9.7	Evaluation of Service	41
8.	Appeals	42
9.	Seventh Year Review.....	42

Appendix

Record of Review
Dossier Checklist
Dossier Outline
Lecturer Peer Review Form

1. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Tenure Track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure) <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6index.html>; the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html; and any additional policies established by the College of Medicine and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the Chair of the department.

This document sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College of Medicine and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including merit salary increases. In approving this document the Dean and Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to its mission and criteria.

1.1 General Considerations:

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-01.html> of the Administrative Code. Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure. Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance. These are usually colleagues within the same department. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes, to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-02.html> and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to the department and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, faculty, the Chair, or body making that decision will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reason that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence. Each appointment, promotion and/or tenure decision should elevate the mean. A decision to award tenure or to promote a tenured faculty member cannot be made primarily on the basis of a need for that individual's area of expertise or of service to the department, the college or the university, no matter how long or how dedicated. Nor can such a decision be made if a candidate is merely competent in the three areas in which faculty members are customarily judged.

1.2 Other Considerations:

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

Each faculty member is evaluated in the context of his/her contribution to the multi-partite mission of the tenure initiating unit, The College of Medicine, and the University. This will include evaluation of accomplishments in research and scholarship, teaching and education, and service.

2. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The Department of Pharmacology is dedicated to the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge and to providing a state-of-the-art education to undergraduates, professional students, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows concerning the theoretical principles and methodologies used in pharmacology and allied disciplines. Excellence in research and teaching, and service on departmental, college, university or national committees is considered fundamental to achieving the department's mission. Faculty publications and acquisition of extramural research and training grants are central for enhancing the department's educational and research missions. Moreover, the department should provide an environment for the faculty and students to develop their full intellectual, research and educational potential.

The Department of Pharmacology Faculty serve the University by providing the education and training for graduate students in the Integrated Biological Graduate Studies Program, wherein students can obtain the transcript designation of an education and training emphasis in "Molecular Pharmacology, Pharmacogenomics & Therapeutics." Faculty contribute to teaching in other graduate studies programs including the Neuroscience graduate program, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology graduate program, Biochemistry graduate program and Biophysics graduate program.. The Pharmacology Department Faculty teach the bulk of the clinical pharmacology courses in the Medical School curriculum. A Masters in Pharmacology is also offered within the department. The faculty strive to integrate research and teaching to provide the most progressive and challenging environment for students in both the laboratory and the classroom. The research mission of the Department of Pharmacology is to integrate a number of diverse scientific disciplines including molecular, histological, biochemical, physiological, behavioral, computational, and genetic approaches to delineate drug actions and identify potential novel therapeutic targets in the treatment of human disease.

3. APPOINTMENTS

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

promotion will be made with the concurrence of the departmental Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (AP&TC) and the Chair of the department.

3.1 Tenure Track Faculty Appointments:

3.1.1 General considerations:

The candidate must have demonstrated, through clear and convincing evidence, that for the particular appointment, the criteria have been met or exceeded in teaching, scholarship, service, or program development. In the evaluation of candidates for appointment, consideration is based on the overall academic achievement that encompasses some combination of all of the above areas of activity. The candidate should enhance, or have a strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department. Has support for the appointment, demonstrated by a consensus within the department as evidenced by an appropriate faculty review. The College of Medicine endorses the University's recognition of the diverse contributions of faculty members toward the realization of the mission of the institution. Therefore, within the tenure track there will be numerous pathways that reflect the range of faculty activity, skills, and accomplishments. A faculty member's activities may change over time, and thus may be consistent with different pathways of performance throughout their career. All of these pathways and patterns of faculty activity may lead to consideration and granting of tenure. In all cases, the standard of excellence in teaching, scholarship, service, and program development which is documented in an overall evaluation of accomplishment will be expected. Similarly, the development and demonstration of regional, national, or international impact and recognition, as appropriate to the faculty level, will be required. Within each pathway the relative distribution of effort for the primary areas of emphasis may differ for individual faculty members.

Research/Educator Pathway: Faculty with this pattern of activity will primarily be engaged in research, scholarship or other creative activities, and will be expected to be actively engaged in teaching or training at various levels including medical students, residents, fellows, undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, or professional students, and may include peer or continuing education. Publication of research in high quality peer reviewed journals will be a primary measure of achievement in scholarship. Similarly, the obtaining of nationally competitive peer-reviewed funding in support of a focused and thematic program of research will be expected. Demonstration of high quality and effective teaching and education will also be expected. Individuals in this faculty pathway will also be expected to demonstrate achievement in program development and service to the institution, profession, or community.

Educator/Scholar Pathway: Faculty with this pattern of activity will be primarily engaged in teaching or training at various levels including medical students, residents, fellows, undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, or professional students, and may include peer or continuing education; and in providing service to the institution, profession, or community. Scholarship related to educational or service activities will be required. Scholarship is a central facet of this faculty pathway, and will be a primary measure of achievement as reflected in high quality peer-reviewed publications. It is expected that faculty in this pathway will

obtain competitive extramural funding in support of educational programs or innovations. Demonstration of high quality and effective teaching and education will be expected. Demonstration of high quality service with broad impact will also be a primary measure of achievement.

3.1.2 Tenure Track Assistant Professor:

The candidate for appointment as a tenure track Assistant Professor must demonstrate clear and convincing evidence that s/he has a record of impact and recognition at a local or regional level, and has, at a minimum:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.
- A record of excellence or evidence of potential for excellence in teaching, which may include accomplishment in verbal and written communication.
- An initial record of or potential for excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by having begun to develop a body of research, scholarship, and creative work, and initial evidence of an independent program of research as reflected by first author publications and existing or a strong likelihood of independent extramural research funding.
- A record of and potential to perform effective service.
- An attitude which reflects adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors.
<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm>
- Strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks.

An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Tenure cannot be awarded at the rank of Assistant Professor. Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement so merits. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the provision of Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 and paragraphs (G), (H), and (I).

3.1.3 Associate Professor with Tenure:

A candidate for appointment or promotion as a tenured Associate Professor must demonstrate clear and convincing evidence that s/he has a record of impact and recognition at a local or regional level, and has, at a minimum:

- Exceeded the criteria for appointment as a tenure track Assistant Professor.
- Met or exceeded the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

Selection of a candidate at the Associate Professor level will be based on ranking at the candidate's current institution, national research recognition, history of grant awards from national funding agencies, record of publication, record of service both to the university and the scientific community, and the candidate's perceived ability to enhance the academic mission of the department.

3.1.4 Professor with Tenure:

A candidate for promotion or appointment as a Professor with tenure must demonstrate clear and convincing evidence that s/he has, a record of impact and recognition at an international level, and has at a minimum:

- Exceeded the criteria for appointment as an Associate Professor with tenure.
- Met or exceeded the criteria for promotion to full Professor.

Selection of a candidate at the Professor level will be based on attainment of international distinction in education, scholarship and public service, a track record of peer-reviewed extramural funding and grant support from national funding agencies, a substantial record of publication in journals with high impact in their respective field, and a track record of training graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows. Candidates for Professor should be recognized within their discipline by invitations to present seminars at other universities and to present their work at national and international meetings.

3.1.5 Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure:

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. While appointments to these positions generally include tenure, a probationary period may be granted, in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-3, by petition, for a period not to exceed four years. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e. terminal year of employment is offered. Requests for senior rank appointments require the approval of the Dean of the College of Medicine and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the University cannot legally grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

3.1.6 Instructor:

Appointment to the position of instructor can be made to a candidate if all of the criteria for the position of a regular faculty Assistant Professor have been met with the exception that the candidate will not have completed the terminal degree, or other relevant training, at the time of the appointment. Further, appointment at the rank of instructor is appropriate for individuals who, at the time that they join the faculty do not have the requisite skills or experience to fully assume the full range of responsibilities of an Assistant Professor.

When an individual is appointed as an instructor, the letter of offer should indicate the specific benchmarks and accomplishments that will be necessary for promotion to Assistant Professor. Instructor appointments are limited to three years with the third year being the terminal year. The formal review for promotion should begin no later than the beginning of the third year, and must be completed no later than six months prior to the end of the third year. The promotion review must follow the procedures for fourth year review, including review by the College of Medicine. When an instructor is promoted to Assistant Professor, prior service credit will be granted for the time spent as an instructor unless the faculty member requests in writing at the time of the promotion that s/he does not wish the credit.

Criteria for appointment as an Instructor (tenure track):

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Individuals who have completed all the requirements of their terminal degree, but who have not obtained the final degree at the time of initial employment will be appointed as an instructor.
- Lack of a sufficient post-doctoral training to permit full assumption of all responsibilities of Assistant Professor rank.
- Evidence of potential for excellence in teaching, which may include accomplishment in verbal and written communication.
- Evidence of potential for excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by having produced a body of research, scholarship, and creative work in association with mentors, but has not yet demonstrated substantial evidence of an independent program of research as reflected by first author publications and/or independent funding.
- A record of and potential to perform effective service.
- An attitude which reflects adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors.
<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm>

3.2 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty:

A no-salary joint appointment for regular university faculty from another department is a courtesy appointment. A courtesy faculty appointment must be consistent with the departmental AP&T documents, 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. Appointments may be withdrawn if the appointee does not contribute to the teaching, administration, service and scholarly activities of the department as anticipated in the original granting of the title. Individuals with courtesy appointments (primary appointments in other departments with no salary from the Department of Pharmacology) may not vote in the Department of Pharmacology on matters of college or university governance or policy as they will be voting in their home department on such matters. Individuals with courtesy appointments may vote on departmental matters concerned with teaching, research and service if they participate in these activities.

3.3 Regular Research Track

3.3.1 General

Appointments of faculty to the regular research track are made in accordance with faculty rule 3335-7. Faculty members appointed to the regular research track are expected to focus their efforts on research. A research faculty member may, but is not required to, participate in limited educational activities in the area of his or her expertise. Research faculty members are expected to contribute to the research mission of the Department and are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected in high quality peer-reviewed publications and applications and successful competition for extramural funding of their research program. Regular research track faculty in the Department will comprise no more than twenty per cent of the number of tenure-track faculty in the unit unless otherwise authorized by majority vote of regular tenure-track faculty. In all cases, however, the number of regular research track faculty positions in a unit must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in the unit.

The criteria for appointment as a research track faculty member are distinct from the criteria for tenure-track faculty in that research faculty are not required to perform classroom teaching or to participate in the service component required of tenure-track faculty. The criteria for appointment, for reappointment and nonreappointment, and for promotion will reflect the preponderance of responsibilities in those activities involving research.

Research track faculty in the Department will be eligible to serve on all departmental committees with the exception of the promotion and tenure committee. However, they will not be eligible to vote on matters related to the departmental work-load policy or other departmental governance policies. Research track faculty will be eligible to serve on university committees and task forces but not on university governance committees. Research track faculty will also be eligible to advise and supervise graduate and postdoctoral students and to be a principal investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to

advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the graduate school as set forth in rule 3335-5-29 and detailed in the graduate school handbook.

Contracts will be for a period of at least one year and for no more than five years, and must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, research faculty appointments will require one hundred per cent salary recovery and are at the discretion of the Chair in accordance with the guidelines provided in this document. It is expected that salary recovery/support will be derived from extramural funds. The initial contract is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether s/he will be reappointed for the following year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

Transfers from the research track to the tenure track are not permitted, but research track faculty are eligible to apply for tenure-track positions through a competitive national search. Tenure track faculty may request transfer to the research track if the request is initiated by the faculty member, and approved by the Department chairperson, Dean of the College of Medicine, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

An individual who was previously a Research Scientist in the Department of Pharmacology may resume this position after termination from the Research Faculty track.

3.3.2 Research Assistant Professor

Candidates for appointment as a research assistant professor in the Department will be reviewed by the Department Promotions and Tenure Committee to advise the chair of the suitability of the candidate for appointment to this rank.

Candidates for appointment as Research Assistant Professor in the Department must provide clear and convincing evidence of a record of impact and recognition at a local or regional level, and have, at a minimum:

Criteria for Appointment as Research Assistant Professor:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.
- Completion of sufficient post-doctoral research training to provide the basis for establishment of an independent research program.
- An initial record of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by having begun to develop a body of research, scholarship, and creative work, and initial evidence of an independent program of research as reflected by first authored publications and existing external funding or a strong likelihood of independent extramural research funding.

- A clear plan for salary support during the contract period that is approved by the Chair of the Department.
- An attitude which reflects adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors.
<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm>
- Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

3.3.3 Research Associate Professor

Candidates for appointment as a research associate professor in the Department will be reviewed by the Department Promotions and Tenure Committee to advise the chair of the suitability of the candidate for appointment at or promotion to this rank. Candidates for appointment as a research associate professor must provide clear and convincing evidence of a record of impact and recognition at the national level. At a minimum, such candidates should have:

- Exceeded the criteria for appointment as a research assistant professor in the Department.
- Met or exceeded the College of Medicine criteria for promotion to research associate professor.
- Met or exceeded the departmental criteria for promotion to research associate professor, including:
 - A record of accomplishment in scholarship as demonstrated by having developed a body of research, scholarship, and creative work as a lead investigator, and evidence of an independent program of research as reflected by first or corresponding authored publications in high impact journals, and existing and continued independent extramural research funding as principal or co-principal investigator.
 - Recognition by peers of accomplishments at the national level, as indicated from letters of evaluation of the candidate. Letters of evaluation from peers will be solicited by the Chair of the Department in consultation with the Department Promotions and Tenure Committee.
- A clear plan for salary support during the contract period that is approved by the Chair of the Department.
- An attitude which reflects adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors.
<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm>

- Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

3.3.4 Research Professor

Candidates for appointment as a research professor in the Department will be reviewed by the Department Promotions and Tenure Committee to advise the chair of the suitability of the candidate for appointment at or promotion to this rank. In the Department, appointment of a candidate as a research professor requires that the candidate has provided clear and convincing evidence of a record of impact and recognition at the national and international level, and has at a minimum:

- Exceeded the criteria for appointment as a research associate professor in the Department.
- Met or exceeded the College of Medicine criteria for promotion to research professor.
- Met or exceeded the criteria for promotion to research professor in the Department, including:
 - A distinguished record of accomplishment in scholarship as demonstrated by having developed a body of research, scholarship, and creative work as a principal investigator, and evidence of an independent program of research as reflected by corresponding authored publications, consistent publication in peer-reviewed journals of high impact, and existing and continued independent extramural research funding as principal investigator.
 - Recognition by peers of accomplishments at the national and international level as indicated from letters of evaluation of the candidate. Letters of evaluation from peers will be solicited by the Chair of the Department in consultation with the Department Promotions and Tenure Committee.
- A clear plan for salary support during the contract period that is approved by the Chair of the Department.
- An attitude which reflects adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors.
<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm>
- Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

3.4 Auxiliary Faculty:

The Rules of the University Faculty, Chapter 3335-5-19 defines the faculty of the university. The auxiliary faculty is comprised of persons having regular titles below 50%

FTE, including no salary appointees, clinical auxiliary faculty, visiting faculty (e.g. visiting Assistant Professor), adjunct faculty (adjunct Assistant Professor) and lecturer. Members of the auxiliary faculty are not eligible for tenure. With the exception of lecturer, criteria for initial appointment of auxiliary faculty should, in most cases, be consistent with those for the regular track appointment since the primary function of auxiliary faculty is educational. In the case of auxiliary faculty with extensive research accomplishments, the criteria for appointment may include those typical for the regular tenure track. Appointment renewal decisions are made annually and are based upon contributions to the teaching, administration, service and scholarly activities of the department. Auxiliary faculty members may not vote, but may be asked to offer opinions regarding specific issues for which they may have meaningful information.

3.5 Emeritus Faculty:

Emeritus faculty are persons who have served the university meritoriously who, upon retirement, are recommended by the Departmental AP&TC, Chair, Dean and provost for emeritus status. Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure decisions. Emeritus faculty may have privileges as the department or Office of Human Resources may provide (Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (D)).

4. Procedures for Appointment

4.1 Tenure Track Faculty:

Appointment of tenure track faculty can be made in one of two ways: by college procedures; or by departmental procedures. For college searches, candidates identified by the Dean for tenure track appointments as directors or heads of institutes, centers or other strategic units, may be considered for appointment in the department. The curriculum vitae of the candidate will be reviewed by the faculty to determine whether such an appointment meets the goals and missions of the department. The departmental faculty should have an opportunity to meet with the candidate. When appropriate, a research seminar should be presented by the candidate. The Chair will forward a letter to the Dean indicating the interest of the faculty.

Candidates identified by the Dean who are not directors or heads of institutes, centers or other strategic units must undergo a full review and evaluation by the department AP&TC. This includes submission of appropriate materials outlined in departmental documents. Furthermore, the candidate must present a research seminar and meet with the faculty individually or as a group. After evaluation, the AP&TC will provide its recommendation to the Chair who will make an independent evaluation of the candidate and will then send a letter indicating the department's recommendation to the Dean. For departmental searches to identify tenure track faculty candidates the Chair will consult with the faculty prior to the appointment of a search committee in order to assess the issues regarding strategic planning or programs and the areas of need or interest deemed necessary for continued growth and development of the department. This discussion is expected to identify the qualifications, characteristics and faculty rank to be sought in a prospective candidate. The Chair of the department will appoint a search committee with one of its members as chair and another as the Procedures Oversight

Designee. The search committee will develop a position description based on guidelines provided by the Chair and advertise it locally and nationally. The search committee is expected to generate a pool of applicants, evaluate their qualifications, proceed with invitations for research seminars by the candidates, provide a short list of candidates and recommendations for appointment to the AP&TC. The AP&TC will evaluate the applicants and forward their recommendations and the list to the Chair.

4.1.1 Assistant Professors:

A national/international search will be conducted by a search committee appointed by the Chair unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves an exception to this policy. The search committee shall consist of at least half the members from the Department of Pharmacology, and additional outside faculty or other qualified persons. A vigorous effort will be made to ensure that a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates is considered for appointment. The search committee will evaluate the candidates and forward their recommendations to the AP&TC. The AP&TC will evaluate the candidates using criteria set out in departmental documents and will send recommendations to the Chair. The Chair will negotiate the conditions of appointment with the candidate.

4.1.2 Associate Professors and Professors:

A national/international search will be conducted by a search committee appointed by the Chair unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves an exception to this policy. The search committee shall consist of at least half the members from the Department of Pharmacology, and additional outside faculty or other qualified persons. A vigorous effort will be made to ensure that a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates is considered for appointment. The search committee will generate a short list from the candidates and send it along with their recommendations to the AP&TC. The AP&TC will evaluate the candidates' credentials using the criteria set out in departmental documents. They will send the list and their recommendation to the Chair who will negotiate the conditions of appointment with the candidate. An appointment of Associate Professor or Professor will generally entail tenure.

Appointments at Senior Rank, with or without tenure require prior approval by the college dean and the Office of Academic Affairs of a Draft Letter of Offer accompanied by the following required documentation:

- Copy of the draft letter of offer
- Candidate's CV
- Five (5) external evaluations from appropriate referees, not all of whom were suggested by the candidate
- Reviews and recommendations by the:
 - AP&TC
 - Department Chair
 - College Dean
 - Consultation with the college promotion & tenure committee is at the discretion of the dean

Foreign Nationals approved for Associate Professor with Tenure or Professor with Tenure must be informed in the letter of offer that although they have been reviewed and approved for tenure, they must obtain permanent residency before tenure may be awarded. Probationary tenure track faculty must be informed in the letter of offer that permanent residency status must be obtained before tenure may be awarded, should their mandatory tenure review be successful.

4.1.3 Courtesy Appointments:

To accomplish the research and education mission of the department it may be necessary to appoint faculty members with a primary appointment in another department as a joint member of the Department of Pharmacology. The Department Chair or a faculty member may initiate the procedure for appointment. Documentation required include a letter of nomination from the Chair or faculty member outlining the attributes of the nominee and a current CV. Appointments should satisfy one of two criteria.

- The individual should be nationally and/or internationally recognized for outstanding scholarly activity and such an appointment would enhance the department's reputation.
- The individual should be a member of a pharmacology society, publish in pharmacology society journals, or be active in a departmental program (focus group, collaborative research grant, etc). In addition, will be expected to attend at least 25% of department faculty meetings and seminars during an academic year and acknowledge membership in the department on scholarly publications.

The department faculty, with the chair of the AP&TC presiding, will review applications and send a recommendation to the Chair regarding the applicant. A joint appointment may be withdrawn if the above conditions are not met.

4.1.4 Auxiliary Faculty:

Auxiliary appointments are for only one year at a time and thus require formal annual renewal by the AP&TC and the Chair if they are to be continued. Faculty seeking auxiliary status must send a letter of request along with a curriculum vitae to the Chair. Alternatively, a departmental faculty member may nominate a candidate for such an appointment. Whether the request is initiated by the candidate or by a member of the departmental faculty, a curriculum vitae and a letter should be included stating reasons for the affiliation as well as suggestions on how the person would contribute to the research and educational missions of the department. The Chair will forward the letter and curriculum vitae to the AP&TC who will review the request and send their recommendations to the Department Chair.

Continuation of the appointment is contingent upon ongoing contributions. Decisions to not renew an auxiliary appointment will be based on failure of the faculty to meet the criteria established for their selection as outlined in department documents.

Criteria for promotion in rank of auxiliary faculty will follow the guidelines for promotion of tenure-track faculty. Application for promotion will be evaluated by the AP&TC and forwarded to the Chair. Successive levels of review will be performed only if the recommendation at the preceding level was positive. A negative recommendation at any level indicates the final decision is negative and the case will not go forward. Promotion will not be considered without contributions to departmental missions.

4.1.5 Emeritus Faculty:

A faculty member or the Chair may recommend a retiring member for emeritus status. The evaluation for appointment to emeritus status is performed by the AP&TC and should consider the overall contributions of the faculty member to his or her field of study, to teaching and to service to the department, college, university and national community. The candidate for emeritus status should provide a current curriculum vitae and any other relevant documentation deemed appropriate to facilitate evaluation.

4.2 Research Track Faculty

For departmental searches to identify research track faculty candidates the Chair will consult with the faculty prior to the appointment of a search committee in order to assess the issues regarding strategic planning or programs and the areas of need or interest deemed necessary for continued growth and development of the department. This discussion is expected to identify the qualifications, characteristics and faculty rank to be sought in a prospective candidate. The Chair of the department will appoint a search committee with one of its members as chair and another as the Procedures Oversight Designee. The search committee will develop a position description based on guidelines provided by the Chair and advertise it locally and nationally. The search committee is expected to generate a pool of applicants, evaluate their qualifications, proceed with invitations for research seminars by the candidates, provide a short list of candidates and recommendations for appointment to the AP&TC. The AP&TC will evaluate the applicants and forward their recommendations and the list to the Chair.

4.2.1 Research Assistant Professors:

A national search will be conducted by a search committee appointed by the Chair. The search committee shall consist of at least half the members from the Department of Pharmacology, and additional outside faculty or other qualified persons. A vigorous effort will be made to ensure that a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates is considered for appointment. The search committee will evaluate the candidates and forward their recommendations to the AP&TC. The AP&TC will evaluate the candidates using criteria set out in departmental documents and will send recommendations to the Chair. The Chair will negotiate the conditions of appointment with the candidate.

4.2.2 Research Associate Professors and Professors:

A national search will be conducted by a search committee appointed by the Chair. The search committee shall consist of at least half the members from the Department of Pharmacology, and additional outside faculty or other qualified persons. A vigorous effort will be made to ensure that a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates is considered for appointment. The search committee will generate a short list from the candidates and send it along with their recommendations to the AP&TC. The AP&TC will evaluate the candidates' credentials using the criteria set out in departmental documents. They will send the list and their recommendation to the Chair who will negotiate the conditions of appointment with the candidate.

Appointments at Senior Rank require prior approval by the college dean and the Office of Academic Affairs of a Draft Letter of Offer accompanied by the following required documentation:

- Copy of the draft letter of offer
- Candidate's CV
- Five (5) external evaluations from credible writers, not all of whom were suggested by the candidate
- Reviews and recommendations by the:
 - AP&TC
 - Department Chair
 - College Dean
 - Consultation with the college promotion & tenure committee is at the discretion of the dean

5. ANNUAL REVIEWS

Annual written performance reviews that look both backward and forward are mandated for all tenure track faculty.

The annual review should:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the development of professional development plans that meet the joint needs of the department and the faculty member.
- Establish the goals against which faculty performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future by establishing a faculty workload policy to determine the percentage of time devoted to research, teaching and service consistent with department and university policy. Ideally each should receive 33% of faculty time.
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resources allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

For probationary faculty the annual review is a critical component of monitoring progress toward tenure and is a determinant of whether the probationary appointment will be continued for another year or terminated, subject to relevant standards of notice (Faculty Rule 3335-6-08).

The following are requirements of the annual review process for all faculty:

- Current faculty CVs are to be maintained in an accessible location in the department where any faculty member can review them.
- A face-to-face meeting is required between the department Chair and a probationary faculty member. A face to-face meeting between the Chair and a tenured faculty member is required if either party requests a meeting.
- The review culminates in a letter or other written report by the Chair that must include:
 1. Summary of strengths and weaknesses in the faculty member's performance.
 2. [For probationary faculty] A decision to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year or to terminate the probation subject to relevant standards of notice (Faculty Rule 3335-6-08).
 3. [Except when non renewal of probationary of appointment is being recommended] Advice for improvement and discussion of goals for the future and expectations and plans for professional development.
 4. Statement informing the faculty member of the right to review his or her primary personnel file and to include a written comment on any material in the file.

5.1 Probationary Faculty:

At the time of appointment, a probationary faculty member will be provided with all pertinent documents detailing the department, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If the documents are revised during the probationary period, a probationary faculty member will be provided with copies of the revised documents.

During a probationary period faculty members will be evaluated annually in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 and with the policies of the department, college and university. Annual reviews of untenured faculty will follow the procedures for review for promotion and tenure. Annual reviews will entail an evaluation of a faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship and service, as well as evidence of continuing development. The Chair will indicate to the faculty member when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs Dossier Outline (http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html) to be completed by the faculty member for reporting accomplishments to date. The faculty member must provide: 1) a current curriculum vitae, and 2) written indication of future goals. External evaluations of the faculty member's performance may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by an advisory committee (composed of three tenured faculty appointed by the Chair of the department, see Patterns of Administration V. E.). Probationary faculty must acquire both student and faculty evaluations of their teaching. These evaluations will be discussed with the Junior Faculty Advisory Committee and the Chair annually.

The annual review will include a written evaluation by the advisory committee. The evaluation will address the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service as well as evidence of continuing academic development. The review process is meant to be constructive to an untenured faculty member. It is meant to communicate candidly and clearly aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to

make acceptable progress. In the written review the faculty member will be reminded that s/he can review his or her personnel file and place any responses to the evaluation into the file. The advisory committee will forward their recommendations to the Chair who will make an independent assessment. The Chair will meet with the faculty member and discuss his/her progress. The Chair's written review will include both strengths and weaknesses of past performance, assessment of future professional development and whether reappointment is recommended. It will include a reminder that the faculty member can respond to the review and place those responses in his/her file. All annual review letters will become a part of a faculty member's dossier during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. The Chair will provide the Dean with a written assessment of the probationary faculty's performance and an indication of reappointment status.

A fourth year review recommendation, an annual review recommendation not to reappoint a probationary faculty member, a promotion and tenure recommendation, or promotion recommendation forwarded from the Department for review by the college dean, must be reviewed by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Each year, the dean will establish the latest date for the receipt of dossiers from the Department on candidates for promotion and/or tenure and reappointment. The College AP&TC will review the dossier and recommend to the dean the action to be taken. Committee recommendations shall be in writing to the dean, along with a report of the vote of the committee on the particular matter deliberated by the committee. The Dean will consider the recommendations of the committee and will recommend in writing, to the executive vice president and provost, the action to be taken.

Probationary appointments may be terminated in any probationary year for inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. If the advisory committee recommends reappointment but the Chair believes non-renewal is more appropriate, or if the advisory committee recommends non-renewal, the probationary faculty's case will be put before the full eligible faculty for consideration and vote (majority of eligible faculty needed). The full eligible faculty will provide a report to the Chair. If the Chair recommends non-renewal, the case will be sent to the Dean for review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a non-renewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with fourth year review procedures as set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03. Notification on non-renewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08.

Decisions affecting the non-renewal of a probationary appointment may not be arbitrary or capricious or carried out in violation of a faculty member's right to academic freedom. Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 provides a procedural mechanism under which an aggrieved probationary faculty member can challenge a non-renewal decision believed to have been improper. In that instance, however, the burden of proof is on the probationary faculty member to establish that the non-renewal decision was improper. (See also 3335-6-05).

5.1.1 Exclusion of Time from the Probationary Period:

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) provides for time to be excluded in increments of one year from the probationary period for responsibilities related to birth or adoption of a child (<6 yrs old). The request to exclude time for this reason must be made within one year of the birth or adoption and before the start of the mandatory tenure review year. Requests must be submitted to the Chair of the department for approval and forwarded to the Dean who must approve the request as does the Office of Academic Affairs, unless approval is barred by provisions of the Faculty Rule.

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

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

Probationary faculty members may apply for consideration of an exclusion at any time, but prior to the beginning of the year in which mandatory review must occur. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a non-renewal notice has been issued. The maximum time that can be excluded is one year for instructor, two years for Assistant Professor (including time spent as an instructor) and one year for Associate Professor except in extraordinary circumstances. Faculty members will continue to be reviewed annually regardless of time excluded unless absence from the campus makes such a rule impractical. Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted under the terms of this rule.

5.2 Procedures: Tenured Faculty

Every faculty member must have an annual review to assess performance. The Chair will inform a faculty member when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of an annual report outline to be completed by the faculty member for reporting accomplishments. The faculty member must provide: 1) a current curriculum vitae and 2) a written indication of future goals and plans.

At the completion of the review, the Chair will provide the faculty member with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance with a reminder that the faculty member can review his/her personnel file and place any responses to the evaluation into the file. The assessment will include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate and the salary recommendation for the coming year with an explanation for that recommendation. All annual review letters will become a part of a faculty member's dossier.

5.3 Regular Research Track Faculty:

The annual review process for regular research track probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, except that nonprobationary regular research faculty may participate in the review of regular research faculty of lower rank.

In the penultimate contract year of a regular research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-07-08.html> must be observed.

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

6. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

Merit increases will be denied to faculty who submit insufficient documentation to permit informed evaluation of their performance, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

6.1 Criteria:

The money available to the university for salary increases is usually fixed. This money is to be distributed among faculty in a manner that recognizes recent performance, but also seeks to insure that differences in salary levels among faculty are equitable and are based on the mission of the department. It is understood that completion of expected responsibilities does not constitute meritorious performance. Evaluation of meritorious performance requires demonstrable achievements which substantially exceeds the expectations for a faculty member.

On occasion, one time cash payments or other rewards are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/reward are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

Merit salary adjustments will be based on performance in research, teaching, and service activities. Adjustments will be guided by the workload policy established by the chair and a faculty member. The Chair will examine salaries each year apart from last year's productivity to insure appropriate salaries are paid to faculty within each rank. Salary equity excellence pay raises will be considered in raise recommendations, but they are separate from merit salary increases.

Faculty will be ranked on research, teaching and service with consideration of the workload policy established between the chair and a faculty member. The highest ranking will be considered outstanding, the second highest will be very good, the third

highest will be average and lowest category will be below average. This terminology is to reflect the terminology used by the college administration. The priorities for ranking are indicated below.

6.1.1 Research:

Because the pursuit of new knowledge in biomedical science is the preeminent role of basic science faculty within the College of Medicine, the greatest weight in evaluating performance will be placed on research productivity, including the acquisition of research grants, contracts and training grants from national peer-reviewed funding agencies, and publication of findings from this work in scholarly journals. Faculty are expected to maintain an active research laboratory funded by peer-reviewed grants from extramural funding agencies and/or contracts from private or governmental sources. The successful acquisition of extramural funding from these sources and publication of findings will be considered the highest performance in this category if the faculty member is principal investigator, and second highest if s/he is co-principal investigator or investigator. In recognition of the challenges presented by the competitive funding climate, the next category of merit will accrue to faculty who have submitted or have pending grant applications considered fundable.

Faculty are expected to publish original research findings in peer-reviewed journals. In keeping with university policy, the absolute number of publications within a given year will not be the only criterion for evaluation. Rather, the highest performance in this category will be publications in journals of high quality and impact. Authorship of critical review articles, book chapters, monographs, textbooks, and computer programs used for either teaching or research will also contribute to ranking at the highest level of performance, so long as these are evaluated by external peer review prior to their publication, and published in a manner that makes their citation accessible through information retrieval systems, such as Medline or specialized Internet sites.

The awarding of patents and licensing agreements for patents when relevant will also be considered as scholarly activity.

A number of important scientific advances have been made by individuals without the benefit of grants from national peer-reviewed funding agencies. In exceptional cases, an individual who makes an important discovery may earn the highest ranking in the research category in the absence of a peer-reviewed grant. The significance of the finding should be well-documented (e.g., publication in a high-impact journal, or by awards from national or international scientific societies). An individual who has made a significant discovery may provide one or more corroborating letters from unbiased outside experts. These letters may be used by the department chair in the annual evaluation of merit.

6.1.2 Teaching:

All faculty are expected to participate in the teaching mission of the department, particularly in the pharmacology component of either the Integrated Biomedical Science Graduate Program (IBGP), Integrated Medical Science Program (IMS) or Independent Study Programs (ISP). Next to research, teaching is a key criterion for

faculty evaluations. All faculty are expected to perform to the best of their ability in teaching. In addition, they may participate in any other relevant courses such as graduate or undergraduate classes. For probationary faculty, student evaluation and faculty evaluations of their teaching is mandatory. Quality of teaching shall be judged for all teaching faculty by standardized student evaluations obtained from an unbiased source when appropriate. In addition to student evaluations, peer-review of tenured faculty and probationary faculty of lectures to students by selected members of the department is mandatory. Quality of teaching shall be judged for all teaching faculty by standardized evaluations (appendix) obtained from an unbiased source when appropriate.

6.1.3 Service:

Faculty are expected to participate in the service mission of the department. Recognition for service and ranking will be based upon the commitment such service entails. Participation on peer review groups for national research funding agencies, such as NIH study sections, service as an officer in a scientific society, organizer of a national or international meeting, editor or associate editor of a peer-reviewed journal, or serving as director of an interdepartmental graduate program, such as Neuroscience, Integrated Biomedical Science Graduate Program (IBGP), Molecular Cellular and Developmental Biology (MCDB), or Ohio State Biochemistry Program (OSBP), service on an editorial board of a peer-reviewed journal, or member of a departmental, college, university or national committee and service as a referee for peer-reviewed journals are important considerations in evaluating service.

6.2 Procedures:

Merit salary increases will be determined based on the quality of the faculty member's teaching, scholarly activity and service for the past year with consideration of the previous three year period. The faculty member must provide to the Chair: 1) a current curriculum vitae, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place and 2) a written indication of future goals and plans. The Chair will assess the provided materials and recommend a salary that reflects a composite of scores for research activities, teaching and service.

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.

6.3 Documentation:

Documentation of the following academic activities in the promotion and tenure dossier outline (http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html) to the Chair for each faculty member will serve as the basis for merit ranking and the accumulated documents for promotion and tenure decisions.

6.3.1 Scholarly Activity:

6.3.1.1 Research Grants and Contracts:

Documentation should be provided by the faculty member of the funding agency, dates of research grant proposal submissions, grant duration, direct and indirect costs, titles, principal investigators, co-principal investigators and investigators, percent effort and the status of both funded and pending grants.

6.3.1.2 Publications:

Documentation should include a bibliography of publications with full citation of author(s), article title, journal title, initial and final pages, journal volume and year. For probationary faculty there should also be a description of the contribution made to each publication.

6.3.1.3 Patents:

Patent description, number if available, status and dates should be documented.

6.3.2 Teaching:

6.3.2.1 Medical and Professional Education:

Provide hours of teaching and course name. Provide student and faculty teaching evaluations and indicate degree of involvement, i.e., course director, module leader, coordinator, lecturer, etc.

6.3.2.2 Graduate Teaching and Training:

Provide student and faculty teaching evaluations (where appropriate) and indicate level of involvement, i.e., teaching by oneself a full quarter graduate or professional course; supervising the training of graduate students and fellows; serving as course director for a graduate course; module leader for IBGP; participating in the team teaching of graduate courses, and/or in the training of rotating graduate student.

6.3.2.3 Undergraduate Education and Training:

Provide student and faculty teaching evaluations (where appropriate) and indicate level of involvement, i.e., teaching by oneself a full quarter undergraduate course, or serving as organizer and teaching in such a course, participation in team-taught undergraduate courses; providing a research opportunity for at least one quarter to an undergraduate student in a defined research project.

6.3.2.4 Other:

Indicate if providing research opportunities for at least one quarter to a high school student working on a defined research project.

Provide 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.

6.3.3 Service:

Provide written assessment by committee chair (if appropriate) and indicate the time period and capacity of participation in: peer-review groups for national research funding agencies, such as NIH study sections, service as an officer in a scientific society, organizer of a national or international meeting, editor or associate editor of a peer-reviewed journal, director of an interdepartmental graduate program, such as Integrated Biomedical Science Graduate Program (IBGP), Neuroscience, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology (MCDB), Ohio State Biochemistry Program (OSBP), service on an editorial board of a peer-reviewed journal, or member of a departmental, college, university or national committee and service as a referee for peer-reviewed journals.

6.4 Equity-Excellence Salary Adjustments:

When equity-excellence salary adjustments are provided by the university, a comparison of salaries will be made with national standards of salaries for public universities across academic ranks. Ranking and recommendations of faculty to the Dean for adjustments will be based on salary differentials and the criteria outlined above for Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards.

7. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION

7.1 Probationary Period

An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, and tenure will not be awarded at this rank. The maximum probationary period will be six years. Faculty members will be reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of probationary service, and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, a seventh and final year of employment will be offered. It is anticipated that not all faculty members will require the full probationary period, and that consistent with 3335-6-03(2), promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. Similarly, a probationary period may be terminated at any time, subject to the notice provisions of faculty rule

3335-6-08 and the provisions of paragraphs (G), (H), and (I) of this rule. The annual review and fourth year review procedures as specified in faculty rule 3335-6-03(C) will be followed.

7.2 Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure:

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C): Because the preeminent activities of faculty in the Department of Pharmacology are research and teaching, the awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has demonstrated excellence as both a researcher and teacher. In addition, a probationary faculty member will be held to a high standard of departmental citizenship and demonstrated commitment to service at the departmental, college or university levels. Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of Associate Professor. Evidence that the faculty member has the potential to develop professionally and to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the department is also necessary. A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must have obtained significant peer-reviewed grant support from a national funding agency during the probationary period. If there is a lapse in funding at the time of their evaluation for promotion, consideration will be given to previous grant history and potential for obtaining new grant support. Untenured faculty will be given pharmacology teaching assignments from the Chair or the pharmacology streamer leader.

Faculty are considered by the AP&TC according to traditional criteria for evaluating each faculty member's contribution to research, teaching and service and the dedication to these aspects of academic life on behalf of the department, college, university and goals. For promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must display continuing scholarly activity, excellent performance in research and teaching and must be an effective provider of service. The overall activities and scholarly contributions of the faculty member establish the relative database for determining the adequacy and promise for continued career development. According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (D): In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility will be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphasis on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of a faculty member may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases, care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances, superior intellectual achievement, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

7.3 Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Professor

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C): Promotion to the rank of Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a record of continued funding from extramural sources and a sustained record of excellence in research. The faculty member should have produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized

nationally and internationally and has demonstrated leadership in teaching and service. A faculty member primarily involved in teaching must have established an international or national reputation as an educator. This includes successful application for grants to develop teaching materials or software programs used for computer-assisted instruction, publications in educational-based journals and/or publication of a nationally recognized textbook(s). The department should expect an individual ready for promotion to Professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. While the individual seeking promotion should be assessed in relation to assigned responsibilities, exceptional performance in these responsibilities should be required.

For promotion to Professor, service constitutes participation in any number of national, university, college or departmental committees. This could include service on peer-review groups for national research funding agencies, such as NIH study sections; service as an officer in a scientific or as a member of a national committee; editor or associate editor of a peer-reviewed journal, member of an editorial board or journal reviewer; organizer of a national or international meeting or invited symposium speaker; director of a national or international meeting or invited symposium speaker; director of an interdepartmental graduate program, or service as a member of a university, college or departmental committee.

7.4 Criteria: Promotion and Reappointment of Regular Research Faculty

Research track faculty have a highly focused responsibility in research care. Research faculty are not eligible for tenure, but are eligible for reappointment. Reappointment of research track faculty, for both annual and five-year terms, will be based upon continued progress toward meeting the expectations of the appointment. The evaluation of research track faculty for annual reviews as well as for reappointment or promotion consideration should follow the same departmental procedures as employed for review of tenure track and clinical track faculty. During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, regular research faculty appointments may be terminated for not meeting the terms of the contract (e.g. failure to obtain extramural support for the research).

Appointments may also be terminated during a contract period for cause (see rule 3335-5-04 of the Administrative Code), or financial exigency (see rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code), and the termination decision for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by faculty rules. In addition, a contract may be renegotiated during a contract period only with the voluntary consent of the regular research faculty member. By the end of the penultimate year of each contract period, the regular research track faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the current contract period. If a new contract is not extended, the final year of the current contract is a terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment. The standards of notice set forth in rule 3335-6-08 of the Administrative Code apply to regular research faculty track appointments.

The procedures for reviewing regular research track faculty annually and for reappointment/nonreappointment and promotion shall be set forth in the relevant, tenure-track faculty approved, departmental appointments, promotion and tenure document and shall be consistent with review procedures established for tenure-track faculty including those set forth in rules 3335-6-03 and 3335-6-04 of the Administrative Code except that

the college dean's decision shall be final with respect to reappointment and non-reappointment and with respect to denial of promotion.

The promotional criteria for research will be the same as those for the regular tenure track faculty for each of the ranks.

7.4.1 Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Research Associate Professor

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that that the candidate has developed a regional or national level of impact and recognition, and since being appointed to the rank of Research Assistant Professor the candidate has

- Established an independent program of research as demonstrated by a continuing record of scholarship including publication of innovative and high impact research in peer-reviewed journals. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program.
- Through their research, established a regional or national reputation, and have demonstrated an impact on their field. Indicators of this impact may include, but are not limited to citation counts, invitations to lecture at peer academic institutions or scientific societies, service on extramural research review groups, service on editorial boards or leadership positions in scientific societies.
- Demonstrated adherence to the values contained in Statement of Professional Ethics of the American Association of University Professors.

7.4.2 Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Research Professor

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Research Professor must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that that the candidate has developed a national or international level of impact and recognition, and since being appointed/promoted to the rank of Research Associate Professor the candidate has

- Maintained an independent program of research as demonstrated by a continuing record of scholarship including publication of innovative and high impact research in peer-reviewed journals. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program.
- Through their research, established a national or international reputation, and have demonstrated an impact on their field. Indicators of this impact may include, but are not limited to citation counts, invitations to lecture at peer academic institutions or scientific societies, service on extramural research review groups, service in editorial leadership positions, or elected offices or other leadership positions in scientific societies.
- Demonstrated adherence to the values contained in Statement of Professional Ethics of the American Association of University Professors.

7.5 Criteria: Promotion of Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary faculty are not eligible for tenure and are reappointed annually. Auxiliary faculty with regular titles will be expected to demonstrate a greater contribution to scholarship, and will be evaluated using the same criteria as those for faculty on the regular tenure track. Reappointment will be based upon documented sustained contributions to the department.

7.6 Procedures: Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Reviews for tenure and promotion will be performed by the departmental AP&TC. The constitution of the AP&TC is described in the Patterns of Administration. On the basis of the submitted materials by the candidate, the AP&TC will establish the strengths and weaknesses of each regular faculty member reviewed. A written evaluation will be sent to the department Chair and the individual faculty member. The Chair will make an independent evaluation and send a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and the AP&TC.

7.6.1 Check list:

A checklist must be completed for each candidate at each level of review and be included in the dossier before it goes to the next level.

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

7.6.2 Procedural Oversight Designee:

One member of the AP&TC will be designated as the Procedural Oversight Designee. Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of the AP&TC must accept personal responsibility for assuring that the procedures for reviews are correct, fair and free of bias. The designee must verify that the citations listed in the dossier are accurate. The designee will also ensure that the review body at each level follows written procedures governing the reviews. The designee will monitor for the equitable treatment of women and minorities.

If the designee has concerns about the review, s/he will bring it to attention of the body generating the concerns. If the dossier is not prepared correctly, the designee should ask the faculty member who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not followed, those not following them should be informed. If concerns cannot be resolved, they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator. The relevant administrator must provide a response explaining why the action was or was not warranted.

7.6.3 Conflict of Interest:

A faculty member should not participate in a review if there is a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest exists when a member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisor), 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.

7.6.4 Letters of Evaluation:

7.6.4.1 External Letters:

Each dossier must contain letters of evaluation requested by the departmental Chair. A minimum of 5 letters from distinguished persons in the field who are able to evaluate critically the faculty member's scholarly work and comment on its significance will be requested. A list of potential evaluators is assembled by the AP&TC, 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. Section B(3) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html> requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. The department will follow the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html, for letters requesting external evaluations.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiated 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. 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.

7.6.4.2 AP&TC Letter:

AP&TC consisting of tenured Associate Professors and Professors should provide a detailed written assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work and services indicating the strengths and weaknesses. A report of the numerical vote of the voting body should be included.

7.6.4.3 Chair's Letter:

An independent, detailed written assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work and services indicating the strengths and weaknesses by the Chair should be included. The evaluation should take into account the recommendations of the AP&TC. If the Chair's opinion differs from the AP&TC's, the basis for the difference must be addressed.

7.6.4.4 Other Letters:

Letters of evaluation from departments or centers in which the faculty member has joint appointments are optional only if the appointment is for zero time and entails little interaction with faculty duties in the other department.

7.6.5 Publications:

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. 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.

If publications are multi-authored, the nature of the intellectual contributions should be described along with the percentage of the faculty member's contribution to the total effort. The quality of scientific papers will be evaluated primarily by the members of the AP&TC.

A bibliography of publications should include a full citation of author(s), article title, journal title, initial and final pages, journal volume and year. Symposia, invited papers and book chapters are also of great significance in reflecting the activity and recognition accorded the faculty member and should be identified. Any other collaborative ventures should be cited.

7.6.6 Other Research Activities:

Documentation of grants and contracts received, prizes, and awards for research or scholarly activity should be included. Patents will also be considered as research contributions. Documentation of patents should include patent description, number, status and dates.

Documentation of scientific presentations at international, national, state and local scientific meetings should be provided as well as evidence for participation as an organizer of international or national symposia or meetings. Titles, dates, meeting sites, role of the faculty member should be provided.

Editorships of journals, books or scholarly activity or reviewer for journals and other publications are deemed peer recognition of knowledge in the field and should be included.

7.6.7 Evaluation of Teaching:

As educators, faculty must participate in the teaching mission of the Department of Pharmacology. This consists of teaching medical students, graduate students, medical or postdoctoral fellows or undergraduate students. Where appropriate, faculty are encouraged to participate in precollege education, such as offering summer research experience to high school students.

Evaluation will be based on quality and extent of teaching of medical students, graduate students, undergraduate or medical fellows in didactic courses, formal laboratory courses or informal instruction. Student teaching evaluations should include evaluations by medical and graduate students of lectures given in medical, IBGP or graduate courses and faculty peer-review evaluations.

7.6.7.1 Quality of Teaching:

7.6.7.1.1 Student Evaluations:

Faculty should document the quality of teaching by providing student evaluations of courses from an unbiased source. The College and University provide student evaluation forms to be distributed to students. Receipt of teaching awards will be considered as one indication of the quality of teaching.

7.6.7.1.2 Peer Evaluations:

For probationary faculty, the advisory committee or designated faculty members will conduct an evaluation of lectures and teaching materials during each year until the sixth year review. The evaluation should take the form of the Lecturer Peer Review Form (details provided in the Appendix to this document). These evaluations will be discussed with the probationary faculty member and placed in his/her file.

7.6.7.2 Other Teaching Considerations:

The number of hours given to teaching and the course level are important considerations in evaluating teaching.

7.6.8 Evaluation of Service:

Service constitutes participation in university, college or departmental committees, peer reviewing of journal articles or other editorial contributions, participation in national or professional organizations or societies. Committee name, capacity of service (member) and years of service should be documented. For editorial service, indicate the journals, number of manuscripts reviewed, years of service and editorial

capacity (reviewer, editor, etc.). Indicators of quality of service beyond the department or external to the university include election or appointment to leadership roles, other evidence that the candidate's services are sought after rather than volunteered, and awards. It may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those in a position to evaluate specific contributions.

7.6.9 Other Service Activities:

Membership in scholarly societies, such as American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, or other professional societies should be indicated.

7.7 Procedures: Promotion to Professor

Reviews for promotion will be performed by the departmental AP&TC. The constitution of the AP&TC is described in the Patterns of Administration. Faculty evaluations will entail the application of the criteria noted below. A faculty candidate should request an informal review of their documents by the AP&TC before a formal review is initiated. The informal review is meant to provide a candidate with a candid evaluation of the documentation before a formal review begins.

On the basis of the submitted materials, the AP&TC (Professors only) will establish the strengths and weaknesses of each regular tenured faculty member reviewed and send a written evaluation with a recommendation to the department chair. The Chair will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member. At a meeting of the Chair and the AP&TC (Professors only), a vote will be taken by written secret ballot on whether a faculty member should be promoted to Professor. The Chair will participate in the discussion, but will not vote. Appointment will be recommended following an affirmative majority vote. If the majority vote is negative, a letter stating the reason for denial of promotion will be sent by the Chair to the faculty member and to the Dean of the college within five working days. In the event that the recommendation by the Chair and AP&TC differ, the Chair will send a letter to the AP&TC stating the reasons for the non-concurrence. The Chair will send a letter to the candidate within five working days documenting both positions and forward the letter and the documents provided by the AP&TC to the Dean.

7.7.1 Check List:

A checklist must be completed for each candidate at each level of review and be included in the dossier before it goes to the next level.

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

7.7.2 Procedural Oversight Designee:

One member of the AP&TC will be designated as the Procedural Oversight Designee. Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of the AP&TC must accept personal responsibility for assuring that the procedures for reviews are correct, fair and free of bias. The designee must verify that the citations listed in the dossier are accurate. The designee will also ensure that the

review body at each level follows written procedures governing the reviews. The designee will monitor for the equitable treatment of women and minorities.

If the designee has concerns about the review, s/he will bring it to attention of the body generating the concerns. If the dossier is not prepared correctly, the designee should ask the faculty member who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not followed, those not following them should be informed. If concerns cannot be resolved, they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator. The relevant administrator must provide a response explaining why the action was or was not warranted.

7.7.3 Conflict of Interest:

A faculty member should not participate in a review if there is a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest exists when a member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisor), 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.

7.7.4 Letters of Evaluation:

7.7.4.1 External Letters:

Each dossier must contain letters of evaluation requested by the departmental Chair. A minimum of 5 letters from distinguished persons in the field who are able to evaluate critically the faculty member's scholarly work and comment on its significance will be requested. A list of potential evaluators is assembled by the AP&TC, 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. Section B(3) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html> requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. The department will follow the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html, for letters requesting external evaluations.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiated 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. 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.

7.7.4.2 AP&TC Letter:

AP&TC consisting of professor only should provide a detailed written assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work and services indicating the strengths and weaknesses. A report of the numerical vote of the voting body should be included.

7.7.4.3 Chair's Letter:

An independent, detailed written assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work and services indicating the strengths and weaknesses by the candidate should be included. The evaluation should take into account the recommendations of the AP&TC. If the Chair's opinion differs from the AP&TC, the basis for the difference should be addressed.

7.7.4.4 Other Letters:

Letters of evaluation from departments or centers in which the faculty member has joint appointments are optional only if the appointment is for zero time and entails little interaction with faculty duties in the other department.

7.7.5 Publications:

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. 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.

If publications are multi-authored, the nature of the intellectual contributions should be described along with the percentage of the faculty member's contribution to the total effort. The quality of scientific papers will be evaluated primarily by the members of the AP&TC.

A bibliography of publications should include a full citation of author(s), article title, journal title, initial and final pages, journal volume and year. Symposia, invited papers and book chapters are also of great significance in reflecting the activity and recognition accorded the faculty member and should be identified. Any other collaborative ventures should be cited.

7.7.6 Other Research Activities:

Documentation of grants and contracts received, prizes, and awards for research or scholarly activity should be included. Patents will also be considered as research contributions. Documentation of patents should include patent description, number, status and dates.

Documentation of scientific presentations at international, national, state and local scientific meetings should be provided as well as evidence for participation as an organizer of international or national symposia or meetings. Titles, dates, meeting sites, role of the faculty member should be provided.

7.7.7 Evaluation of Teaching:

As educators, faculty must participate in the teaching mission of the Department of Pharmacology. This consists of teaching medical students, graduate students, undergraduate students or medical fellows. Where appropriate, faculty are encouraged to participate in pre-college education, such as offering summer research experience to high school students. Evaluation will be based on quality and extent of teaching of medical students, graduate students, undergraduate or medical fellows in didactic courses, formal laboratory courses or informal instruction.

7.7.7.1 Quality of teaching:

7.7.7.1.1 Student Evaluations:

Faculty should document the quality of teaching by providing student evaluations of courses from an unbiased source. Receipt of teaching awards will be considered as one indication of the quality of teaching.

7.7.7.1.2 Peer Evaluations:

For tenured faculty, an ad hoc committee appointed by the Chair will conduct a peer evaluation of teaching materials, audiovisual materials and of several lectures during the current review. With respect to course materials, there will be an evaluation of objectives, assessment of whether topics are current, whether syllabi are informative and whether audiovisual aids are appropriate. The COM&PH provides a Lecturer Peer Review Form (Appendix) that may serve as the basis for peer evaluation of faculty teaching. These evaluations will be discussed with the faculty member and placed in his/her file.

7.7.7.2 Other Teaching Considerations:

The number of hours given to teaching and the course level are important considerations in evaluating teaching.

7.7.8 Evaluation of Service:

Service constitutes participation in university, college or departmental committees, peer reviewing of journal articles or other editorial contributions, participation in national or professional organizations or societies. Committee name, capacity of service and years of service should be documented. For editorial service, indicate the journals, number of manuscripts reviewed, years of service and editorial capacity (reviewer, editor, etc.). Indicators of quality of service beyond the department or external to the university include election or appointment to leadership roles, other evidence that the candidate's services are sought after rather than volunteered, and awards. Candidates for promotion to Professor should be recognized by their selection to serve on peer review panels of major national funding agencies, such as NIH and NSF. It may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those in a position to evaluate specific contributions.

7.8 Procedure: Promotion for Research Associate Professor

The department's procedures for promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 <http://oaa.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html> and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion reviews http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html.

Reviews for promotion will be performed by the departmental AP&TC. The constitution of the AP&TC is described in the Patterns of Administration. On the basis of the submitted materials by the candidate, the AP&TC will establish the strengths and weaknesses of each regular research faculty member reviewed. A written evaluation will be sent to the department Chair and the individual faculty member. The Chair will make an independent evaluation and send a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and the AP&TC.

7.8.1 Check list:

A checklist must be completed for each candidate at each level of review and be included in the dossier before it goes to the next level.

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

7.8.2 Procedural Oversight Designee:

One member of the AP&TC will be designated as the Procedural Oversight Designee. Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of the AP&TC must accept personal responsibility for assuring that the procedures for reviews are correct, fair and free of bias. The designee must verify that the citations listed in the dossier are accurate. The designee will also ensure that the review body at each level follows written procedures governing the reviews. The designee will monitor for the equitable treatment of women and minorities.

If the designee has concerns about the review, s/he will bring it to attention of the body generating the concerns. If the dossier is not prepared correctly, the designee should ask the faculty member who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If

appropriate procedures are not followed, those not following them should be informed. If concerns cannot be resolved, they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator. The relevant administrator must provide a response explaining why the action was or was not warranted.

7.8.3 Conflict of Interest:

A faculty member should not participate in a review if there is a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest exists when a member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisor), 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.

7.8.4 Letters of Evaluation:

7.8.4.1 External Letters:

Each dossier must contain letters of evaluation requested by the departmental Chair. A minimum of 5 letters from distinguished persons in the field who are able to evaluate critically the faculty member's scholarly work and comment on its significance will be requested. A list of potential evaluators is assembled by the AP&TC, 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. Section B(3) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html> requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. The department will follow the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html, for letters requesting external evaluations.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiated 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. 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.

7.8.4.2 AP&TC Letter:

AP&TC consisting of tenured Associate Professors and Professors should provide a detailed written assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in scholarly work and services indicating the strengths and weaknesses. A report of the numerical vote of the voting body should be included.

7.8.4.3 Chair's Letter:

An independent, detailed written assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in scholarly work and services indicating the strengths and weaknesses by the Chair should be included. The evaluation should take into account the recommendations of the AP&TC. If the Chair's opinion differs from the AP&TC's, the basis for the difference must be addressed.

7.8.4.4 Other Letters:

Letters of evaluation from departments or centers in which the faculty member has joint appointments are optional only if the appointment is for zero time and entails little interaction with faculty duties in the other department.

7.8.5 Publications:

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. 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.

If publications are multi-authored, the nature of the intellectual contributions should be described along with the percentage of the faculty member's contribution to the total effort. The quality of scientific papers will be evaluated primarily by the members of the AP&TC.

A bibliography of publications should include a full citation of author(s), article title, journal title, initial and final pages, journal volume and year. Symposia, invited papers and book chapters are also of great significance in reflecting the activity and recognition accorded the faculty member and should be identified. Any other collaborative ventures should be cited.

7.8.6 Other Research Activities:

Documentation of grants and contracts received, prizes, and awards for research or scholarly activity should be included. Patents will also be considered as research

contributions. Documentation of patents should include patent description, number, status and dates.

Documentation of scientific presentations at international, national, state and local scientific meetings should be provided as well as evidence for participation as an organizer of international or national symposia or meetings. Titles, dates, meeting sites, role of the faculty member should be provided.

Editorships of journals, books or scholarly activity or reviewer for journals and other publications are deemed peer recognition of knowledge in the field and should be included.

7.8.7 Evaluation of Service:

Service constitutes participation in university, college or departmental committees, peer reviewing of journal articles or other editorial contributions, participation in national or professional organizations or societies. Committee name, capacity of service (member) and years of service should be documented. For editorial service, indicate the journals, number of manuscripts reviewed, years of service and editorial capacity (reviewer, editor, etc.). Indicators of quality of service beyond the department or external to the university include election or appointment to leadership roles, other evidence that the candidate's services are sought after rather than volunteered, and awards. It may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those in a position to evaluate specific contributions.

7.8.8 Other Service Activities:

Membership in scholarly societies, such as American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, or other professional societies should be indicated.

7.9 Procedure: Promotion for Research Professor

Reviews for promotion will be performed by the departmental AP&TC. The constitution of the AP&TC is described in the Patterns of Administration. Faculty evaluations will entail the application of the criteria noted below. A faculty candidate should request an informal review of their documents by the AP&TC before a formal review is initiated. The informal review is meant to provide a candidate with a candid evaluation of the documentation before a formal review begins.

On the basis of the submitted materials, the AP&TC (Professors only) will establish the strengths and weaknesses of each regular research faculty member reviewed and send a written evaluation with a recommendation to the department chair. The Chair will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member. At a meeting of the Chair and the AP&TC (Professors only), a vote will be taken by written secret ballot on whether a faculty member should be promoted to Professor. The Chair will participate in the discussion, but will not vote. Appointment will be recommended following an affirmative majority vote. If the majority vote is negative, a letter stating the reason for denial of promotion will be sent by the Chair to the faculty member and to the Dean of the college within five working days. In the event that the

recommendation by the Chair and AP&TC differ, the Chair will send a letter to the AP&TC stating the reasons for the non-concurrence. The Chair will send a letter to the candidate within five working days documenting both positions and forward the letter and the documents provided by the AP&TC to the Dean.

7.9.1 Check List:

A checklist must be completed for each candidate at each level of review and be included in the dossier before it goes to the next level.

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

7.9.2 Procedural Oversight Designee:

One member of the AP&TC will be designated as the Procedural Oversight Designee. Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of the AP&TC must accept personal responsibility for assuring that the procedures for reviews are correct, fair and free of bias. The designee must verify that the citations listed in the dossier are accurate. The designee will also ensure that the review body at each level follows written procedures governing the reviews. The designee will monitor for the equitable treatment of women and minorities.

If the designee has concerns about the review, s/he will bring it to attention of the body generating the concerns. If the dossier is not prepared correctly, the designee should ask the faculty member who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not followed, those not following them should be informed. If concerns cannot be resolved, they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator. The relevant administrator must provide a response explaining why the action was or was not warranted.

7.9.3 Conflict of Interest:

A faculty member should not participate in a review if there is a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest exists when a member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisor), 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.

7.9.4 Letters of Evaluation:

7.9.4.1 External Letters:

Each dossier must contain letters of evaluation requested by the departmental Chair. A minimum of 5 letters from distinguished persons in the field who are able to evaluate critically the faculty member's scholarly work and comment on its significance will be requested. A list of potential evaluators is

assembled by the AP&TC, 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. Section B(3) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html> requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. The department will follow the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html, for letters requesting external evaluations.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiated 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. 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.

7.9.4.2 AP&TC Letter:

AP&TC consisting of professor only should provide a detailed written assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in scholarly work and services indicating the strengths and weaknesses. A report of the numerical vote of the voting body should be included.

7.9.4.3 Chair's Letter:

An independent, detailed written assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in scholarly work and services indicating the strengths and weaknesses by the candidate should be included. The evaluation should take into account the recommendations of the AP&TC. If the Chair's opinion differs from the AP&TC, the basis for the difference should be addressed.

7.9.4.4 Other Letters:

Letters of evaluation from departments or centers in which the faculty member has joint appointments are optional only if the appointment is for zero time and entails little interaction with faculty duties in the other department.

7.9.5 Publications:

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. 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.

If publications are multi-authored, the nature of the intellectual contributions should be described along with the percentage of the faculty member's contribution to the total effort. The quality of scientific papers will be evaluated primarily by the members of the AP&TC.

A bibliography of publications should include a full citation of author(s), article title, journal title, initial and final pages, journal volume and year. Symposia, invited papers and book chapters are also of great significance in reflecting the activity and recognition accorded the faculty member and should be identified. Any other collaborative ventures should be cited.

7.9.6 Other Research Activities:

Documentation of grants and contracts received, prizes, and awards for research or scholarly activity should be included. Patents will also be considered as research contributions. Documentation of patents should include patent description, number, status and dates.

Documentation of scientific presentations at international, national, state and local scientific meetings should be provided as well as evidence for participation as an organizer of international or national symposia or meetings. Titles, dates, meeting sites, role of the faculty member should be provided.

7.9.7 Evaluation of Service:

Service constitutes participation in university, college or departmental committees, peer reviewing of journal articles or other editorial contributions, participation in national or professional organizations or societies. Committee name, capacity of service and years of service should be documented. For editorial service, indicate the journals, number of manuscripts reviewed, years of service and editorial capacity (reviewer, editor, etc.). Indicators of quality of service beyond the department or external to the university include election or appointment to leadership roles, other evidence that the candidate's services are sought after rather than volunteered, and awards. Candidates for promotion to Professor should be recognized by their selection to serve on peer review panels of major national funding agencies, such as NIH and NSF. It may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those in a position to evaluate specific contributions.

8. APPEALS

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

9. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year review. Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, a department may petition the Dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the unit and the chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

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

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

APPENDIX

Record of Review

Dossier Checklist

Dossier Outline

Lecturer Peer Review Form

RECORD OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION IN ACADEMIC RANK-TENURE-REAPPOINTMENT

Last Name _____ First Name _____ M.I. _____

OSU Emplid _____ College _____ Regional Campus _____

TIU (Tenure Initiating Unit) _____ TIU Org # _____

- U.S. Citizen Foreign national with permanent resident status ("green card")—**copy attached**
- Applied for permanent residency on _____ (Form I-485 receipt date)—**copy attached**
- H-1B Temporary Worker Visa valid until _____ (expir. date)—**copy of approval notice attached**
- Other (**copies of immigration documents attached**)

100% FTE	List below joint appts (split FTE) or appt in TIU under 100% FTE:		
	TIU Org #	TIU Name	FTE
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

A letter from the head of each joint (split FTE) appt unit (**excluding 0% courtesy appts**) must be included in the dossier.

REGULAR FACULTY TRACK Tenure Clinical Research

AUXILIARY Auxiliary clinical Cleveland Clinic Reg title under 50% FTE Adjunct

ACTION CONSIDERED

REG TENURE TRACK Promotion only Promotion & Tenure Tenure only

REG CLINICAL TRACK Promotion only Promotion & Reappt Reappt only

REG RESEARCH TRACK Promotion only Promotion & Reappt Reappt only

AUXILIARY APPOINTMENT Promotion only

Effective date for all approved actions is October 1 (except August 16 for the College of Law)

NEW RANK IF PROMOTION ACTION IS APPROVED

Professor Associate Professor Assistant Professor

Date of initial faculty appointment* at Ohio State _____
 *Current faculty status in the case of transfer to or from regular tenure, clinical, research track or auxiliary appointmentt.

Date of last reappointment [contract renewal] _____ [reg clinical or research track faculty only]

Yrs Excluded per Fac. Rule 3335-47-03 _____ Yrs Prior Svc Credit _____ [probationary tenure track faculty only]

Last **approved** P&T action _____ Effective date _____

Last **non-approved** P&T recommendation _____ Review year _____
 (Does not include voluntary withdrawal from review process)

	RECOMMEND	DO NOT RECOMMEND	
Regional Campus Dean _____	_____	_____	_____ Signature
TIU Head [chair/director] _____	_____	_____	_____ Signature
Dean _____	_____	_____	_____ Signature

XI. Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Dossier Checklist for 2005/06
Updated 3/25/2005

CANDIDATE _____

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING
Required Documentation

- **Included** for every course taught in the past 5 years or since date of hire, if less than 5 years ago
- **Correctly placed in dossier**
 - *Item 6*—summary tables
 - *Appendix*—individual course fixed-response reports

RESEARCH
Required Presentation

- **Authors** in *Item 12* are listed:
 - in the order in which they appear on each publication
 - in the standard citation style for my discipline
- **Multiple authorship** in *Item 12* for jointly authored papers, in *Item 16* for research grants, includes :
 - **narrative description** of my intellectual contribution

I have followed the examples of narrative description provided in the Dossier Outline. I understand that statements such as "all authors contributed equally" or "50% effort" do NOT constitute adequate narrative description of intellectual contribution.

I have prepared my dossier in accordance with the 2005/06 Dossier Outline issued March 25, 2005 and it fulfills all requirements, with special attention to those noted above.

I understand that the review process cannot commence until I have submitted a correctly prepared dossier, and that if substantive errors or omissions are discovered at any stage of the process, the dossier will be returned to me for revision.

Signature of candidate _____ Date _____

TIU-LEVEL REVIEW

INTERNAL EVALUATION

Annual reviews as required by the Dossier Outline are included in *Part II.A.6*. If the set of annual review letters is *incomplete*, a written explanation is provided.

- **Untenured** candidates—all annual review letters since date of hire
- **Tenured** candidates—all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or year of hire with tenure, not to exceed the most recent 5 years

Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc.) as required by the unit's A, P & T document are included in *Part II.A.7*.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

_____ Total faculty *eligible to vote* on this case, e.g. total number of tenured associate + full professors, or total number of full professors.

_____ **Number of YES** votes on this case.

_____ Number of **NO** votes on this case.

_____ Number of combined **YES + NO** votes on this case.

_____ **Percentage of YES** votes from combined YES + NO votes on this case.

_____ **Percentage of YES votes required by the TIU's A, P & T document (e.g. 51% or 67%) in order for its recommendation to be considered POSITIVE.**

Note: Abstentions are not votes per the Office of Academic Affairs' guidelines for A, P & T documents and consistent with Robert's Rules of Order.

I understand that if the tenure initiating unit reviews and forwards a dossier lacking key information and/or containing less than credible external evaluation, the review process may have to begin anew.

TIU* Procedures Oversight Designee _____ **(print)**

Signature _____ **Date** _____

**The Procedures Oversight Designee in colleges without departments should sign above rather than below since these colleges serve as the TIU for their faculty.*

COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEW

I verify the following:

This review was based on performance and was free of bias against underrepresented groups.

The college level review of this candidate was conducted in full accordance with the appointments, promotion, and tenure (A, P & T) document of the college, and the latter document was made available to the college P & T committee as part of the review.

The report of the college P & T committee adequately explains the bases for its judgment and for differing with TIU assessments where such differences exist.

*The dossier fulfills all requirements stated in the **2005/06 Dossier Outline issued March 25, 2005**, with special attention to the points noted above, including all those affirmed by the candidate and by the TIU Procedures Oversight Designee.*

NUMERICAL VOTING RECORD IN THE COLLEGE

THE INFORMATION BELOW IS REQUIRED IN THE OFFICIAL RECORD FOR EVERY REVIEW, EVEN WHEN THE VOTE IS UNANIMOUSLY POSITIVE.

_____ Number of **YES** votes on this case.

_____ Number of **NO** votes on this case.

Note: Abstentions are not votes per the Office of Academic Affairs' guidelines for A, P & T documents and consistent with Robert's Rules of Order.

I understand that if the college reviews and forwards to the Office of Academic Affairs a dossier lacking key information and/or containing less than credible external evaluation, the review process may have to begin anew.

College Procedures Oversight Designee _____ **(print)**

Signature _____ **Date** _____

FINAL CHECK OF DOSSIER CONTENTS
by College Office Staff Member

- **Record of review** signed by regional campus dean; TIU head; college dean (as applicable)
- **Dossier checklist** [this document] signed by candidate; Procedures Oversight Designee for TIU (or college without departments); Procedures Oversight Designee for college with departments; college office staff member performing final check

PART I: INTRODUCTION

- **Biographical statement** of candidate

PART II: EVALUATION

II.A. Internal Evaluation Letters

Every item in Part II.A. should be preceded by a plain page noting the item that follows.

- **Regional campus faculty deliberative body**, if applicable [otherwise no "N/A" page]
- **Regional campus dean**, if applicable [otherwise no "N/A" page]
- **TIU (or college without departments) faculty deliberative body**
- **TIU head**
- **Head(s) of unit(s) in which the candidate has split FTE appointments**, if applicable
- **TIU-level comments process** letters or notation that the candidate declined to provide comments
- **College (with departments) P & T committee**
- **College dean**
- **College-level comments process** letters or notation that the candidate declined to provide comments
- **TIU annual review letters** as required by dossier outline, with written explanation if set is incomplete
- **Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc.)** as required by A, P & T document of TIU

II.B. External Evaluation

- **Summary sheet** of all evaluators from whom a letter was requested, indicating those from whom no letter was received.
- **Letters from at least five (5) external evaluators**, consistent with list on summary sheet, with each letter preceded by a **complete cover sheet**. Do NOT include a cover sheet for evaluators from whom no letter was received.

APPENDIX

- **Individual course fixed-response course student evaluation reports** are included in *Appendix*—not in *Item 6* of the Core Dossier, which should contain only summary tables

I have reviewed the contents of this dossier as summarized above and verify that all required material is included and located in the correct section of the dossier in accordance with the 2005/06 Dossier Outline issued March 25, 2005. I understand that if any substantive omissions are discovered when the dossier is reviewed in the Office of Academic Affairs, the dossier will be returned to the college office for correction before the review may continue.

This dossier contains no extraneous material (i.e. not specifically requested in the Dossier Outline), such as articles, book reviews, news clippings, unsolicited letters, etc. ANY MATERIAL OF THIS KIND THAT WAS EXAMINED DURING THE TIU- OR COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEW MUST BE REMOVED BEFORE THE DOSSIER IS FORWARDED TO THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS.

College office staff member doing final check _____(print)

Signature _____ Date _____

DOSSIER OUTLINE

The *Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank-Tenure-Reappointment* ("Cover Sheet") gives administrators' recommendations with their signatures along with basic information on the faculty member's appointment and the review. It is placed **FIRST** and should be **IMMEDIATELY VISIBLE** when the folder is opened. Do not place anything whatsoever on top of the "Cover Sheet."

Record of Review PDF or Record of Review Word

The *Dossier Checklist* is placed SECOND, immediately beneath the "Cover Sheet."

Dossier Checklist

A single checklist is used to ensure that every dossier meets all requirements before moving to the next level of review. In four stages the candidate, the TIU-level Procedures Oversight Designee*, the college-level Procedures Oversight Designee, and a designated staff member in the college office will use the same checklist to examine the dossier and to ascertain its accuracy and completeness. The college will serve as the final guarantor of the integrity of every dossier before it is forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for the completion of the review process.

*In **colleges without departments** (i.e. colleges that serve as the tenure initiating unit for their faculty), the Procedures Oversight Designee will fulfill the role of the TIU-level designee.

For further information on dossier presentation, see Dossier Submission.

Introduction—Biographical statement and III. Core Dossier are primarily the responsibility of the **candidate**.

Record of Review ("Cover Sheet"); **Dossier Checklist**; and **II. Evaluation** are primarily the responsibility of the **TIU and college**.

I. INTRODUCTION

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

II. EVALUATION

- Only letters solicited by the chair, P & T committee chair, or other authorized person may be considered in the review process and/or included in the dossier.
- All items in this section should be placed *in the order listed* so as to ensure that necessary items are included and may be easily located during the review process.
- **Every item in Part II.A. should be preceded by a plain page noting the item that follows.**

II. A. INTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION

Expectations of the unit against which the candidate is being assessed must be explained in either **1.1)** or **1.2)** and **1)** or **2)** below.

1.1) Regional campus faculty deliberative body's detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.

1.2) Regional campus dean's detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.

1) Tenure initiating unit (TIU)—faculty deliberative body's detailed assessment, to include:

- Thorough assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, regarding both strengths and weaknesses.
- Report of the discussion by the faculty deliberative body.

- **Numerical vote** of the full faculty deliberative body.

2) TIU head (or dean in colleges without departments)—independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses.

This assessment should take into account the faculty deliberative body's recommendation. If the TIU head's assessment and/or recommendation differs from that of the faculty, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

3) Head of any unit in which the candidate holds a joint (split FTE) academic appointment —independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. Such a letter is optional only when the joint appointment is both **0% FTE** and entails very little interaction between the candidate and the unit.

3.1) TIU-level comments process—any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

4) College promotion and tenure committee (in colleges with departments)—independent assessment including the committee's **numerical vote** and recommendation to the dean.

If the college committee's assessment is contrary to the TIU-level assessment, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

5) College dean (in colleges with departments)—independent assessment and recommendation to the provost.

If the dean's assessment and/or recommendation differs from any of the prior assessments or recommendations, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

5.1) College-level comments process—any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

The Office of Academic Affairs has required written annual evaluations of all regular faculty since 1993. If annual review letters are lacking for any of the years specified below, a written explanation is required.

6) Annual review letters.

Untenured candidates: all annual review letters since year of hire.

Tenured candidates: all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or year of hire with tenure, not to exceed the most recent 5 years.

6.1) Written comments on the annual reviews by untenured and tenured candidates shall be included if the candidate requests.

7) Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc). Peer review is required. The material in this section must match requirements set forth in the TIU's appointments, promotion and tenure (A, P & T) document.

ADDITIONS

Departments and colleges may add to the above list any evaluations that are required in their A, P & T documents. For example, in some TIUs that have sections or divisions, a letter from the section or division head is required by the unit.

II.B. EXTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION

- **External evaluation letters must be submitted by regular mail on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator's signature. Such a letter submitted via fax is acceptable when timing is critical, but must be followed by a mailed original.**
- **Evaluations submitted by e-mail are unacceptable.**

REQUIRED FOR TENURE TRACK AND RESEARCH TRACK: At least **five (5)** letters from distinguished persons in the candidate's field who are in a position to critically evaluate the candidate's scholarly work and to comment on its significance in the discipline. Section B(3) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that **no more than one half** of these letters be from persons suggested by the candidate.

- *In order to meet this requirement, more letters should be solicited from persons NOT suggested by the candidate than from persons suggested by the candidate. So as not to exhaust the pool of potential evaluators, it is also best that the number of evaluators suggested by the candidate be limited to three or four.*
- *All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves their removal from the review process.*

See the following two topics below, under REVIEW PROCEDURES II, on obtaining meaningful external evaluations. It is essential that external evaluators meet the criteria set forth. If the dean or provost determines that criteria for external evaluators have not been met, the TIU will be required to seek additional letters during the review process.

- Guidelines for Obtaining Meaningful External Evaluations.
- Sample Letter Directed to an External Evaluator.

OPTIONAL: In the case of a candidate who collaborates extensively with the same individuals, a department may wish to ask the collaborators to describe the candidate's contributions to jointly conducted work.

Collaborators must not be asked to write an external evaluation. They cannot be arms-length since they would be, in part, evaluating their own work. A different request letter from the one sent to regular external evaluators must be sent to research collaborators. Under REVIEW PROCEDURES II see:

- Sample Letter Directed to a Research Collaborator.

1) Summary sheet listing:

- Name and institution of all persons from whom letters were solicited.
- Name of person who suggested each evaluator.
- Whether or not a letter was received for each evaluator.
- Persons who were asked to write, but did not, must be listed on the summary sheet. Cover pages, however, should **not** be included for these persons. (See *Item 3* below.)

2) A single representative example of the letters sent to the evaluators *if these letters were identical*. If different letters, or different sets of material for review, were sent, an example of each must be included along with an explanation of why evaluators were treated differently.

If the letter does not list the materials sent to the evaluators, provide this information separately.

3) External letters preceded by a cover page (External Evaluator PDF or External Evaluator Word) for each letter received, containing the following information:

- Name, title (rank if in the academy), and institutional affiliation.
- Concise summary of the person's qualifications as an evaluator of the candidate. Sufficient information must be provided to establish the credibility of the evaluator; simply to note that the evaluator is a professor at University X or does research in the candidate's area is insufficient. **Do not, however, include the full CV of each evaluator when forwarding the dossiers to the Office of Academic Affairs.**
- Name of person who recommended the evaluator (candidate, chair, or other [specified]).
- Evaluator's relationship to the candidate. This information must be accurate.

III. CORE DOSSIER

Please number pages consecutively within the Core Dossier as outlined below. Page 1 will be the first item in the Core Dossier Outline.

In Parts I and II described above, required materials should be placed in sequence following the outline, but do not have to be paginated.

You must include every item in the Core Dossier Outline in your dossier. If a particular item is not applicable to you, note "N/A" for the item. Do not omit the item.

You should not look at dossiers from the past (including your own) for examples of how to present material, since guidelines change and past formats may no longer be acceptable. If you are unsure about the content needed for a particular item, ask your TIU head or P & T committee chair for assistance.

Present your accomplishments as succinctly as possible and in outline form to the extent possible. Some explanation is valuable but lengthy narrative and explanation may obscure important accomplishments rather than highlight them.

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

Item 6 below should contain only SUMMARY TABLES of SEI (Student Evaluation of Instruction) data. Directions for obtaining **Cumulative SEI Reports** from the Office of the University Registrar are provided under *Item 6*. Individual course fixed-response student evaluation reports should be placed in the **Appendix**, as explained at the end of the Core Dossier outline.

TIME FRAME

In the review process, attention is paid both to productivity since date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent) and accomplishments over one's entire career. In the outline below, some items specifically state the time frame for the requested information. When no time frame is specified, you may provide information for the entire career if it is germane to the evaluation. However, you should supply dates for all listed activities and accomplishments, making it possible for reviewers to identify clearly those that took place since the date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent).

CORE DOSSIER OUTLINE

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

List each course taught and clinical instruction see [Courses/Clinical Instruction PDF](#) or [Courses/Clinical Instruction Word](#)), including the following information:

- Courses taught in chronological order by quarter (Au, Wi, Sp, Su) and year.
- Course number, title, and number of credit hours.
- Official final course enrollment.
- Percentage of course taught by candidate based on proportion of total student contact hours in course.
- Brief explanation of your role, if you were not solely responsible for course, including GTA supervision, course management, team teaching, etc.
- Indication of whether formal course evaluations were completed by students or others by placing a check mark in the appropriate column.

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

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

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

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

Doctoral Students (dissertation advisor).

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

Masters Students Plan A (thesis advisor).

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

Masters Students Plan B (advisor).

Doctoral Students (dissertation committee member).

Doctoral Students (general examination committee chair).

Doctoral Students (general examination committee member).

Do not include service as a Graduate School representative.

Masters Students (thesis committee member).

Masters Students (examination committee member).

b) Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of graduate students for whom you have been the advisor of record, for example, publications during or emanating from graduate program, awards for graduate work, prestigious post-docs or first post-graduate positions.

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

3) Extension and Continuing Education Instruction

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

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

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

5) Brief description of your approach to and goals in teaching, major accomplishments, and plans for the future in teaching

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

Describe the variety of ways in which the quality of your teaching has been evaluated; e.g., student evaluation of teaching, peer review, departmental surveys. Describe how you have used the evaluation information to improve the quality of instruction.

Student Evaluation Data Summaries

a) Fixed-Response Survey. For all courses in which you used a type of fixed-response survey (the SEI, SET or comparable department form) to obtain student evaluations, provide a SUMMARY TABLE. Complete documentation as set forth below is required.

If you have not obtained or retained student evaluations for all or most courses taught during the relevant time frame, and review at this time is not mandatory, the review should be postponed until you have accumulated the required documentation.

Results for every quarter the course was taught are presented horizontally across the page in the SUMMARY TABLE (see examples at [Summary Teaching Eval PDF](#) or [Summary Teaching Eval Word](#)). The table should not simply list item numbers, but should clearly describe the item to which students were responding, i.e., the table should be self-explanatory to anyone who reviews it.

To obtain a **Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Report** that meets Office of Academic Affairs guidelines:

- Go to <http://www.ureg.ohio-state.edu/ourweb/online.html> for a menu of the Registrar's online services.

- FACULTY/STAFF INFORMATION SERVICES is at the top right of the menu. Under this topic, the second subtopic is EMAIL ROSTER & GRADES PROCESSING.
- The last item under the subtopic EMAIL ROSTER & GRADES...is the link for **Instructor's Cumulative SEIs**.
- Entering OSU username (name.number) and password gives access to the cumulative summary.

The Core Dossier proper contains only SUMMARY TABLES, not individual fixed-response student evaluation REPORTS. Reports that tally the results for an entire class of students in a given course (one evaluation form per course per quarter, not one form per student per course per quarter) are placed in the **Appendix**, as explained at the end of the Core Dossier outline.

Only in individualized teaching situations for relatively small groups, such as grand rounds or clinical teaching, may individual evaluations (one per student) be included in the **Appendix**. These responses too might be summarized on a single form for each clinical teaching group, since numbers are small, but Academic Affairs has never insisted on this.

b) Open-Ended (Narrative) Evaluation. For all courses in which you used open-ended evaluation instruments as the primary means of collecting student input, someone other than you must summarize the comments on a course by course basis for inclusion in this section of the dossier. Ask your TIU head to assign this task to someone, and make the request well in advance of the deadline for completion of your dossier. State in the dossier the name and role (such as faculty member or staff member) of the person who wrote the summaries. Any faculty member or qualified staff member may fulfill this task.

For both fixed-response or open-ended evaluation instruments, state on each course summary:

- The role (student, faculty member, or staff member) of the person who handed out and collected the evaluation instrument.
- The number of students in the course and the number of these who completed evaluations.

7) Awards and Formal Recognition for Teaching

List awards you have received for excellence in teaching. Nominations for such awards should not be listed. These awards may include citations from academic or professional units (department, college, university, professional associations) which have formal procedures and stated criteria for awards for outstanding teaching performance. To the extent possible, describe how awardees are selected and the extent of competitiveness of the award.

8) Academic Advising

Identify number and level of advisees seen on a regular basis since date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent). Describe specific responsibilities in advising, e.g., direct enrollment, coordinating advisor, career advisor.

9) Advisor to Student Groups and Organizations

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

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

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

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

Identify contributions to any other student services not covered in the above categories.

11) Student Services Awards or Formal Recognition

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

12) Chronological List of Books, Articles, and Other Published Papers

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

Works under review must be listed separately in *Item j*.

Use the standard citation style for your discipline with authors listed exactly as they are listed on the publication. You must list yourself even if you are the only author.

In cases of multiple authorship for *Items 12 a-e*, a narrative description of your intellectual contribution is required. Examples of appropriate formats for this information include:

I designed the experiment (which was carried out by the graduate student co-authors), and wrote the article.

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

I completed and wrote the literature review for the paper, shared equally with the co-author in the analysis and interpretation of the data, and reviewed the complete draft manuscript..

Statements such as the following are NOT acceptable: "All authors contributed equally"; "50% effort." Do not refer to past dossiers for models of how to write the required description, since they occasionally include unacceptable statements such as these.

You must provide the approximate percentage of your contribution in relation to the total intellectual effort involved in the work if your department or college requires this information. This information is *not required by the Office of Academic Affairs and under no circumstances is it an acceptable substitute for the required narrative description..*

For *Items f-j*: the above information is not needed unless your department requires it.

Include as separate categories:

- a) Books (other than edited volumes) and monographs.
- b) Edited books.
- c) Chapters in edited books.
- d) Bulletins and technical reports.
- e) Peer-reviewed journal articles.
- f) Editor-reviewed journal articles.
- g) Reviews and abstracts (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- h) Papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- i) Unpublished scholarly presentations (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- j) Potential publications in review process (indicate authorship, date of submission, and to what journal or publisher the work has been submitted).

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

14) Brief description of the focus of your research, scholarly or creative work, major accomplishments, and plans for the future

15) Description of quality indicators of your research, scholarly or creative work such as citations, publication outlet quality indicators such as acceptance rates, ranking of journal or publisher, etc. COM requires listing of journal impact factors for publications listed in Section 12, Items a-e. Journal impact factors can be obtained by visiting the Prior Health Science Library. Librarian will be glad to help you.

16) Research funding

In cases of multiple authorship for *Items 16 a-b*, a narrative description (of the type described above for Item 12) of your intellectual contribution is required. List the author or authors in the order in which they appear on the grant proposal.

Statements such as the following are NOT acceptable: "All authors contributed equally"; "50% effort." Do not refer to past dossiers for models of how to write the required description, since they occasionally include unacceptable statements such as these.

You must provide the approximate percentage of your contribution in relation to the total intellectual effort involved in the grant proposal if your department or college requires this information. This information is *not required by the Office of Academic Affairs and under no circumstances is it an acceptable substitute for the required narrative description.*

a) Funded research on which you are or have been the *principal investigator*.

- Period of funding.
- Source and amount of funding.
- Whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant.

b) Funded research on which you are or have been a *co-investigator*.

- Period of funding.
- source and amount of funding.
- Whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant.

c) Proposals for research funding that were submitted but not funded.

- Date of submission.
- Title of project;
- Authors in the order listed on the proposal.
- agency to which proposal was submitted.
- Priority score received by proposal, if applicable.

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

- Source and amount of funding.
- Whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant.

e) Proposals for training grants that were submitted but not funded.

- Date of submission.
- Title of project.
- Authors in the order listed on the proposal.
- Agency to which proposal was submitted.
- Priority score received by proposal, if applicable.

f) Any other funding received for your academic work.

Provide the type of information requested above as appropriate.

- 17) **List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly or creative work.**
- 18) **List of editorships or service as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications.**
- 19) **List of offices held and other service to professional societies.** List organization in which office was held or service performed. Describe nature of organization, i.e., open or elected membership, honorary.
- 20) **List of consultation activity (industry, education, government).** Give time period in which consultation was provided and other information as appropriate.
- 21) **Clinical services.** State specific clinical assignments.
- 22) **Other professional/public service** such as reviewer of proposals or external examiner, *if not listed elsewhere.*
- 23) **Administrative service.** Give dates and description of responsibility.
- a) Departmental committees.
- b) College or University committees.
- c) Affirmative action and mentoring activities.
- d) Administrative positions held.
- e) Other administrative services to/for the University.
- 24) **Major Academic/Professional Awards and Commendations,** *if not listed elsewhere.*

APPENDIX FOR FIXED-RESPONSE STUDENT EVALUATION DATA

Copies of individual course fixed-response student evaluation reports should be placed here. *Item 6* of the Core Dossier proper should include only the SUMMARY TABLES of these reports.

- a) If you used SEI or SET instruments, include all individual course reports.
- b) If you used another type of fixed-response survey instrument, include here one page per course/quarter taught, listing:
- Actual statements to which students responded.
 - Full rating scale of possible responses.
 - For each statement, number of students that selected each response choice.

[End of Dossier Outline]

Lecturer Peer Review Form
The Ohio State University College of Medicine and Public Health

INSTRUCTOR: _____ **DATE:** _____
COURSE AND TOPIC: _____
EVALUATOR: _____

KEY: NI= NEEDS IMPROVEMENT EF= EFFECTIVE AS IS EX= EXEMPLARY NO= Not Observed

1.	Preparation for lecture (faculty was well prepared for lecture) COMMENTS	NI	EF	EX	NO
2.	Rationale/orientation and objectives for lecture (faculty presented a rationale and or objectives for the lecture) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
3.	Interest, enthusiasm and rapport with the audience (faculty exhibited interest in his/her topic) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
4.	Organization of lecture material (faculty presented in an organized manner that was easy to follow) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
5.	Audiovisual and learning materials (teaching materials were clear, legible, of the right size and sufficient contrast to be read by the audience) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
6.	Handouts (if available, were easy to follow, clear, included important points of the lecture and were coordinated with the AV materials) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
7.	Observation of student reactions and interests (faculty maintained eye contact with audience and observed their reactions) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
8.	Pace and level of the lecture (was not too fast or slow and was at a level of understanding appropriate for the audience) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
9.	Asking and answering questions (faculty use rhetorical questions, encouraged audience Q&A, and repeated questions that were asked) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
10.	Use of examples (used examples, cases, problems, etc. to explain concepts) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
11.	Knowledge base (seemed knowledgeable about subject matter) COMMENTS:	NI	EF	EX	NO
12.	Overall lecturing quality (rate the overall quality of the lecturer)	NI	EF	EX	NO

STRENGTHS:

WEAKNESSES:

OVERALL COMMENTS:

