

**APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE  
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**

**DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL EDUCATION AND ANATOMY  
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE  
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

Departmental Approval 01/24/2025

Approved by the Faculty 07/01/2016  
Last Approved by the Faculty 01/24/2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs 02/17/2025

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
I. Preamble	4
II. Department Vision and Mission Statement	4
III. Definitions	5
A. Committee of Eligible Faculty	5
1. Tenure Track Faculty	6
2. Clinical Faculty	6
3. Research Faculty	7
4. Associated Faculty	7
5. Conflict of Interest	8
6. Minimum Composition	9
B. Quorum	9
C. Recommendations from the Committee of Eligible Faculty	10
1. Appointment	10
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	10
IV. Appointments	10
A. Criteria	11
1. Tenure Track Faculty	11
2. Clinical Faculty	13
3. Research Faculty	15
4. Associated Faculty	17
5. Regional Campus Faculty	20
6. Emeritus Faculty	20
7. Joint Appointments	20
8. Courtesy Appointment for Faculty	21
B. Procedures	21
1. Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	21
2. Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus	24
3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	24
4. Transfer from the Tenure Track	24
5. TIU Transfer	24
6. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	25
7. Regional Campus Faculty	25
8. Joint Appointments	26
9. Courtesy Appointment Faculty	26
V. Annual Performance and Merit Review	26
A. Documentation	28
B. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	28
1. Fourth-Year Review	29
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock	30
C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	30
D. Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus	31
E. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	31
F. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	31
G. Regional Campus Faculty	32
H. Salary Recommendations	32

1. Criteria	32
2. Procedures	33
VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	33
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	33
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	34
2. Promotion to Professor with Tenure	40
3. Promotion of Clinical Faculty	43
a. Promotion from Clinical Instructor to Assistant Clinical Professor, Clinical Educator Pathway	44
b. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Clinical Professor to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Educator Pathway	45
c. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Clinical Professor to Clinical Professor, Clinical Educator Pathway	48
d. Promotion from Clinical Instructor to Assistant Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway	51
e. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Clinical Professor to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway	52
f. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Clinical Professor to Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway	56
4. Promotion of Research Faculty	59
a. Criteria for Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor	59
b. Criteria for Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor	61
5. Associated Faculty	62
B. Procedures	63
1. Tenure Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	64
a. Candidate Responsibilities	64
b. Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities	69
c. Department Chair Responsibilities	72
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	74
3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	74
4. External Evaluations	75
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	78
VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews	78
IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	79
A. Student Evaluation	79
B. Peer Evaluation	79
X. Appendix	82
A. Required Submission Items	82
B. Promotion and Tenure Process Levels	82
C. Promotion and Tenure Key Dates and Deadlines	83
D. Promotion and Tenure Timeline	84

## **I. Preamble**

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the College of Medicine and university to which the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy and its faculty are subject.

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 the appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the Department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the 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 Department mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to this Department and the College of Medicine; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's [policy on affirmative action and equal employment opportunity](#).

## **II. Department Vision and Mission**

### **Vision Statement**

The vision of the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy is to become a local, regional, national and international leader in the education and training of biomedical professionals using highly integrated and innovative evidence-based approaches.

## **Mission Statement**

The mission of the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy is to advance basic and clinical medical sciences education through innovative and integrated curricula and scholarship, as well as to advance and promote basic and clinical medical science faculty in the domains of excellence in teaching and scholarship.

Scholarship is defined as the achievement of local, regional, national and international recognition in the faculty member's area of expertise including, but not limited to, education, basic science, bioethical, clinical and translational research.

Through this mission, faculty in the department will strive to create and enhance innovative programs, curricula, and teaching/learning methods that facilitate the evidence-based education of the biomedical workforce.

The department will strive for excellence in the education of undergraduate, graduate, professional, and post-graduate students (i.e., post-doctoral, resident and fellow) as well as faculty and community professionals. Dedication to the promotion of scholarship is the foundational core of the department.

## **III. Definitions**

### **A. Committee of Eligible Faculty**

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the department.

The department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

The chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty shall be a tenured faculty member recommended by the members of the committee and appointed by the chair of the department. The chair of the committee serves a two-year term. In the second year, a chair-elect is selected, whose 2-year term will begin at the end of the current chair's term.

The Committee of Eligible Faculty is charged with providing the department chair with input concerning the promotion and tenure of departmental faculty, review and recommendations for any associated faculty appointments, and the annual review of faculty members. The committee will also promote awareness of promotion and tenure procedures and standards among departmental faculty, especially early career faculty, and offer counsel on such matters as requested.

## **1. Tenure-track Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment Reviews**

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

### **Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the promotion reviews of associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

## **2. Clinical Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment Reviews**

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant clinical professor, an associate clinical professor, or a clinical professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all clinical faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

### **Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, all nonprobationary associate clinical professors, and all nonprobationary clinical professors.
- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate clinical professors, and the reappointment reviews of clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary clinical professors.

### **3. Research Faculty**

#### **Initial Appointment Reviews**

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

#### **Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of research assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors and all nonprobationary research associate professors and professors.
- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of research associate professors and the reappointment reviews of research professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary research professors.

### **4. Associated Faculty**

#### **Initial Appointment and Reappointment**

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all

tenure-track faculty, all clinical faculty, and all research faculty in the department. The reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair.

Initial appointments at senior rank, will require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary clinical faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

## **Promotion Reviews**

Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track, clinical track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, clinical titles, and lecturer titles.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.

For the promotion reviews of associated clinical faculty, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for clinical faculty as described in Section III.A.2 above.

For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary clinical faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

## **5. Conflict of Interest**

### **Search Committee Conflict of Interest**

A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process if the member:

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- 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 extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

### **Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest**

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when he/she/they are or have been to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

Such faculty members will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

### **6. Minimum Composition**

In the event the department does not have three eligible faculty members who can undertake the review, the department chair, after consulting the dean, will appoint a faculty member(s) from another Department within the college to participate in the review and vote.

### **B. Quorum**

All meetings of the Committee of Eligible Faculty must be face-to-face unless prevented by circumstances beyond the committee's control and agreed upon by the committee. The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on

Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

### **C. Recommendations from the Committee of Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not allowed. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

#### **1. Appointment**

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for appointment is secured only when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their appointment.

#### **2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion**

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, or contract renewal.

### **IV. Appointments**

The Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy has tenure-track, clinical, research and associated faculty as well as courtesy appointments. All senior faculty appointments at the level of Associate Professor or Professor require approval of the college and university. New senior faculty appointments require an external review of the candidate.

For the purpose of this document, “scholarship” is defined as the achievement of local, regional, national and international recognition in the faculty member’s area of expertise

including, but not limited to, educational, basic science, bioethical, clinical and translational research.

## **A. Criteria**

The Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy 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, scholarship 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.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment, as stipulated in the college guideline [Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document](#), Section IV. B.

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

### **1. Tenure Track Faculty**

#### **Instructor**

Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed, and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

### **Assistant Professor**

An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7<sup>th</sup> year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Eligible Faculty 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 except for an approved request to extend the tenure probationary period.

### **Associate Professor and Professor**

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure or Professor with tenure and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with

review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible.

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

## **2. Clinical Faculty**

Clinical faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

In the Department of Biomedical Education & Anatomy, clinical faculty are equivalent in importance to tenure track faculty. Clinical faculty pathways exist for those whose principal career focus is outstanding teaching, clinical, translational, population health, educational, learning health system science or quality improvement/implementation science research, and delivery of exemplary clinical service. Clinical faculty members will generally not have sufficient time to meet the scholarship requirements of the tenure track within a defined probationary period. For this reason, the nature of scholarship for the clinical faculty differs from the tenure track and may be focused on a mixture of academic pursuits including the scholarship of practice, integration, clinical informatics, community engagement, advocacy and education, and discovery of new knowledge. Faculty members appointed to the clinical faculty may choose to distinguish themselves in patient care, teaching, innovative educational program development, or research (scholarship). Faculty members appointed to the clinical faculty may choose to distinguish themselves by accomplishment through Clinician Educator and Clinical Excellence Pathways. Clinical faculty members are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters of tenure track faculty.

Clinical faculty are expected to contribute to all aspects of the department's mission including teaching, scholarship and service. Appointment of Clinical Faculty will include those individuals who are primarily involved in teaching and education-based scholarship and service. These activities may include, but are not limited to, undergraduate, graduate, professional, postgraduate and post-professional education, advisement and student mentoring, clinical teaching, continuing professional and peer education, curriculum and course development, application of creative instructional strategies and other learning enhancements, recruitment, and honors advisement. The individual appointed must have the appropriate clinical credentials and/or certifications as may be required for their profession. Clinical Faculty must strive to bring the most current information into the classroom and be dedicated to the teaching-

learning-mentoring process. This should be reflected by excellence in teaching and the development or enhancement of quality educational programs.

The Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy, as part of a distinguished comprehensive medical center and university, is committed to the appointment of Clinical faculty who, in addition to their teaching responsibilities, will make significant contributions to the body of knowledge in their field of expertise through educational scholarship and service. Clinical faculty will be expected to at least contribute to the educational scholarship and productivity of the department through supportive and collaborative roles. Clinical faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in service to the Department, College, University, community and their profession. This may also include excellence in clinical teaching, scholarship and service for faculty with a defined clinical role.

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other clinical faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate clinical professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

**Clinical Instructor.** Appointment is normally made at the rank of clinical instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree or other necessary training at the time of appointment. The Department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. As noted above, an appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

**Assistant Clinical Professor.** Candidates for appointment at Assistant Clinical Professor are expected to have an earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree, to have completed all relevant training, including residency and fellowship where appropriate, consistent with the clinical or educational goals of the Department. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

**Associate Clinical Professor and Clinical Professor.** Appointment at the ranks of Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree, to have completed all relevant training, including residency and fellowship where appropriate, consistent with the clinical or educational goals of the Department. Candidates for appointment at these ranks must also meet, at minimum, the Department's criteria—in teaching, service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks described in section VI of this document.

### **3. Research Faculty**

The Research faculty are expected to focus primarily on scholarship that includes, but is not limited to, educational, basic science, clinical and translational research. Research faculty may, but are not required to, participate in teaching and service activities.

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

Appointments to the Research faculty are made in accordance with the *University Faculty Rules* [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department. External appointees at the research associate professor or research professor level will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research and service as persons promoted within the department.

Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in a department, Research faculty must comprise no more than twenty per cent of the number of Tenure Track faculty within the department. In all cases, however, the number of Research faculty within a unit must constitute a minority with respect to the number of Tenure Track faculty within the Department.

Contracts will be for a period of at least 1 year and for no more than 5 years and must explicitly state the expectations for the level of salary support to be derived from extramural funds. The contract period is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether they 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 as a result of the initial appointment. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

Tenure is not granted to research faculty.

Research faculty are eligible to serve on departmental and university committees and task forces, but not on university governance committees. Research faculty members also are eligible to advise and supervise graduate and postdoctoral students and to be a principal investigator on extramural research grant or contract applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the Graduate School as detailed in Section XII of the Graduate School Handbook.

### **Research Assistant Professor**

Appointment as Research Assistant Professor is for candidates that have clear and convincing evidence of impact and recognition at local or regional level scholarship that includes, but is not limited to, educational, basic science, clinical and translational research. For appointment as Research Assistant Professor the candidate is expected to have at a minimum:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or possession of equivalent experience or specified certificate.
- 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.
- Initial evidence of an independent research program as reflected by first or senior author publications and/or multiple co-authorships
- Existing or strong likelihood of extramural research funding as principal investigator, co-principal investigator, co-investigator on multiple grants or one of several program directors on network-type or center grants.
- A strong record of adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors.
- Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.



## **Research Associate Professor**

Appointment criteria for Research Associate Professor are identical to the criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VI.A.4a of this document.

## **Research Professor**

Appointment criteria for Research Professor are identical to the criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VI.A.4b of this document.

## **4. Associated Faculty**

Associated Faculty appointments are for faculty members that focus on a specific and well-defined aspect of the department's mission, most commonly outstanding teaching. Associated Faculty may be involved in scholarly pursuits and service to the department, college, or university, but this is not required for advancement. Associated Faculty, as defined in the *Rules of the University Faculty 3335-5-19* (D), include "persons with adjunct titles, clinical titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles," plus "professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than fifty per cent service to the university."

At a minimum, all candidates for Associated Faculty appointments must meet the following criteria:

- Associated Clinical Faculty with clinical responsibilities must be a licensed physician or health care provider.
- All appointed Associated Faculty must have significant and meaningful interaction in at least one of the following mission areas of the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy:

(1) Teaching of undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral, dental students, medical students, residents, or fellows. For community physicians providing outpatient teaching of medical students, meaningful interaction consists of supervising medical students for at least one month out of the year.

(2) Research within the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy. Associated faculty may collaborate within the College of Medicine or University at large on research projects involving education, basic science, clinical and/or translational scholarship.

(3) Administrative roles within the Department of Biomedical Education and

Anatomy, College of Medicine or University at large. This includes participation in committees or other leadership activities consistent with the overall mission of the department.

Members of the Associated Faculty are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. Associated Faculty appointments may be salaried or non-salaried positions. Associated Faculty appointments are for 1 to 3 years and can be renewed.

### **Associated Faculty at Advanced Rank**

Appointment or reappointment at advanced rank should be based on continued excellence in a specific aspect of the Department mission. All new appointments at advanced rank require prior approval of the college dean, a review and vote of the eligible faculty, an evaluation by the Department Chair, and an evaluation letter from a person that can attest to the faculty member's primary contribution in teaching or scholarship, service and/or clinical care.

The following titles and ranks are those used for Associated Faculty appointments within the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy.

### **Lecturer**

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

### **Senior Lecturer**

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

### **Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor**

The titles of Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, and Adjunct Instructor shall be used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty of equivalent rank. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated service to the Department and who require a faculty title to perform that service ([Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#) (B)). Typically, the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

### **Clinical Instructor of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor of Practice, Clinical Associate Professor of Practice, Clinical Professor of Practice**

Associated clinical practice appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Uncompensated appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated academic service such clinical teaching for the department, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Associated clinical practice rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of clinical faculty. Criteria for appointment at advanced rank are the same as for promotion. Associated clinical practice faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of clinical faculty.

### **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%**

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

### **Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor**

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another

institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

## **5. Regional Campus Faculty**

The Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy appoints regional campus clinical faculty. Regional campus criteria for the appointment of clinical faculty are identical to those for Columbus campus clinical faculty.

## **6. Emeritus Faculty**

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-36](#). Full-time tenure track, clinical, research, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair, who will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

## **7. Joint Appointments**

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a [memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to

the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

## **8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

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

### **B. Procedures**

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

### **1. Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

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

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

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the AA/EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

The [SHIFT](#) Framework serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent and diverse applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified, diverse talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit AA/EEO goals and advance the eminence of the institution.

- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency, fairness, and equity in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the Department chair.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the Department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

The department will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An [MOU](#) must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

## **2. Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Searches for clinical faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on teaching rather than scholarship.

## **3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the virtual or on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class.

## **4. Transfer from the Tenure Track**

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

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

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

## **5. TIU Transfer**

Following consultation with the TIU heads and college dean(s), a tenure-track faculty member may voluntarily move from one TIU to another upon approval of a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made.



Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

The Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

## **6. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department chair based on recommendation from the search committee.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair.

Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

## **7. Regional Campus Faculty**

The appointment of all compensated regional campus faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) and candidate interviews.

As noted, the Department of Biomedical Education appoints regional campus clinical faculty. The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a clinical faculty search, but the dean/director or designee must reach agreement with the BMEA department chair on the position before the search begins. The

regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, department eligible faculty, and either the regional campus search committee or a broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A hiring decision requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

## **8. Joint Appointments**

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.7. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An [MOU](#) signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

## **9. Courtesy Appointment Faculty**

Any departmental faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

## **V. Annual Performance and Merit Review**

The Department Chair or appointed designee must conduct an annual performance and merit review of every faculty member, irrespective of rank, as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must

include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the chair head must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

In all cases, accountability for the annual performance and merit review process resides with the department chair.

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.
- The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.
- Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.
- Annual performance and merit reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment.

- Per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#), the department chair is required to include a reminder in annual review letters that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

## **A. Documentation**

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than the first business day on or after July 1:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document.

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

## **B. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) section (C) covers the rules for annual review of Tenure Track Faculty during the probationary period, including the fourth-year review.

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair (or designee in large units; see Section V above) who meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the department chair (or designee) recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is

forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if provided).

If the department chair or designee recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

### **1. Fourth-Year Review**

The fourth-year review of probationary Tenure Track Faculty shall follow the same process as the mandatory review for tenure and promotion at departmental and college levels as specified in Section VI.B.1, with two exceptions: 1) external letters are not solicited for the fourth-year review, and 2) the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

The original letter of assessment prepared by the Department Chair or appointed designee on behalf of faculty, or alternate member from the executive committee for division/unit directors and others who report directly to the Department Chair, is due along with the faculty member's dossier by close of business on September 1. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall complete its review by October 31. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The Department Chair or designee shall complete the assessment by November 15. The formal comments process specified under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) is followed as in the mandatory review year. After the comments process, the dossier is then sent directly to the college dean for consideration, regardless of whether the department chair or designee recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

Upon a positive recommendation from the department, renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires only the approval of the dean of the college. In accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#), a positive decision results in renewal of the faculty member's appointment for another year.

Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the Department's recommendation, the college dean must consult with the Departmental Committee of Eligible Faculty. If either the Department Chair or designee or the Dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the Dean. A negative decision for the fourth-year review results in termination of the appointment at the end of the fifth year.

The Dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. In all cases, the Dean independently evaluates all faculty in their fourth year of probationary appointment and will provide the Department Chair or designee with a written evaluation of the candidate's progress.

## **2. Extension of the Tenure Clock**

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may extend the probationary period. [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 \(E\)](#) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the Department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

## **C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or appointed designee, who conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or appointed designee, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are

expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair or appointed designee prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

#### **D. Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The annual performance and merit review process for Clinical Probationary and Non-Probationary Faculty is identical to that for Tenure Track Probationary and Tenured Faculty respectively, except that non-probationary clinical faculty may participate in the review of clinical faculty of lower rank. In the penultimate year of a Clinical Faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. This review proceeds identically to the fourth-year review procedures for Tenure Track Faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. If the position 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](#) must be observed. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

#### **E. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The annual review process for Research probationary and Non-Probationary Faculty is identical to that for Tenure Track Probationary and Tenured Faculty respectively, except that non-probationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank. In the penultimate year of a Research faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. This review proceeds identically to the fourth-year review procedures for Tenure Track Faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. 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](#) must be observed. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

#### **F. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation

and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

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

## **G. Regional Campus Faculty**

The Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy's regional campus faculty are clinical faculty. A regional campus clinical faculty member's annual review is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the Columbus campus, proceeding as described above for tenured and tenure-track faculty, and focusing on educational scholarship. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

## **H. Salary Recommendations**

### **1. Criteria**

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for



assessing performance will be the past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

## **2. Procedures**

The Department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. Salary recommendations and other rewards determined by the Department Chair or designee are based on faculty achievement within the context of the current budget and individual performance during the past 36 months and the Department Chair's or designee's review of teaching, scholarship, and service and in the case of division/unit directors, administrative accomplishments. Merit salary decisions are made in the Summer Semester based on the faculty member's dossier for the academic year and the evaluations outlined in Section IV of this document. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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.

## **VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

### **A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion**

Outlined below are the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy's formal criteria for academic advancement, including promotion on each faculty appointment type and awarding of tenure. In evaluating a candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility will be exercised. As the Department, College and University continue to diversify and place new emphasis on interdisciplinary endeavors and program

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

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure, these positive attributes characterize the ability of a faculty member to effectively contribute to exemplary scholarship, teaching and service. A commitment to these values and principles can be demonstrated by constructive responses to and participation in Departmental, College and University initiatives. Examples include activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); participation in faculty governance, outreach and service, ethical behavior, adherence to principles of responsible conduct of research, constructive conduct and behavior during the discharge of duties, responsibilities and authority, and the exercise of rights and privileges of a member of the faculty as reflected in the "[Statement of Professional Ethics](#)" of the American Association of University Professors.

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations. As noted above (see Section V.H.1), except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions.

Annually, the Office of Academic Affairs establishes specific guidelines, procedures, and schedules for the review of candidates for promotion and tenure. The Dean of the College of Medicine also establishes and communicates the latest date for the receipt of dossiers for annual consideration by the College. Upon receipt of a candidate's dossier, the Department Chair will submit the dossier to the Dean of the College of Medicine, who, in turn, will review the dossier and submit it to the College's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee for formal review. The committee will review the dossier and convey to the Dean in writing a recommended action to be taken. The Dean will consider the recommendations of the committee and will convey, in writing, a recommended action to the Executive Vice President and Provost and Department Chair.

## **1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

*The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.*

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the Department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

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

The criteria for promotion are divided into three categories that include teaching, scholarship, and service. The specifics of each of these criteria are outlined below. Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

**Teaching:** A distinctive record of teaching and mentoring excellence is required for promotion and tenure. Evidence demonstrating excellence includes positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and national peers. Teaching awards and other honors are also highly supportive evidence of teaching excellence. A faculty member may also demonstrate a favorable impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development. Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are valued.

Teaching excellence is most commonly demonstrated in this track through evaluations

and peer feedback based on presentations at other academic institutions, presentations or tutorials academic conferences or meetings, presentations at other medical centers or hospitals, and the like. Active participation as a mentor in training or education grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards F31, F32 or other mentored fellowship awards or contracts for trainees is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. In addition, the overall productivity of a faculty member's mentored trainees including, but not limited to, poster presentations, platform presentations and publications may also provide evidence for teaching and mentoring excellence.

The following are considered Required Teaching Criteria for the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy.

- Teach assigned courses, including annual updating of course content.
- Serve assigned roles in supervising and mentoring students.
- Demonstrate excellence in teaching as evaluated by peers, students, administrators, consultants, and others as deemed appropriate.

All faculty must provide evidence of excellence in teaching. Examples of specific metrics for demonstrating excellence in teaching are provided in Table 1 below.

Scholarship: Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. For the purpose of this document, scholarship is specifically defined as the achievement of local, regional, national and international recognition in the faculty member's area of expertise including, but not limited to, education, basic science, bioethical, clinical and translational research. Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, proceedings, or monographs, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in one's field of endeavor. Such endeavors might include laboratory investigation, development of innovative programs, theoretical insight, innovative interpretation of an existing body of knowledge, clinical science, public health and community research, implementation science, and diffusion research, among many potential others. While individual circumstances may vary, both the quantity and quality of publications should be considered. A sustained record of high quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an assistant professor is required for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

Specific metrics in support of excellence in scholarship may be discipline specific. The range of publications may be slightly adjusted in relation to the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is allocated to education and clinical service.

Recognition of the ability to pursue or direct an independent program of inquiry does not diminish the high value placed on collaborative scholarly efforts within the Department, College and University. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued. While individual circumstances may vary, both the quantity and quality of publications should be considered. Due to the extensive variation in disciplines encompassed by the Department, it is difficult to establish expectations for journal impact factors or other metrics such as the H-index. For example, bioethics and medical humanities scholars who do conceptual or analytical work are likely to publish a fewer number of articles than those whose work is primarily empirical. However, all members of the faculty should strive to publish in the highest quality journals in their field and should provide indication of the relative caliber of those journals in their discipline. The number of times a journal article is cited is further evidence of a paper's impact. A sustained record of high quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an Assistant Professor is required for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Specific metrics in support of excellence in scholarship may be discipline specific. For example, clinician investigators will have less time available for research than basic investigators and appropriate adjustments of these criteria should be made. The range of publications may be slightly adjusted in relation to the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is allocated to clinical service. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued, especially to the extent that a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding; or the individual input of the faculty member as a middle author is uniquely contributory and clearly evident.

The following are considered Required Scholarship Criteria for the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy.

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

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

Service: Faculty are expected to actively participate in academic and professional service. Successful candidates for promotion to Tenure Track Associate Professor shall serve on departmental and college committees and shall participate in other activities in support of the missions of the department and college. This basic level of required service may be enhanced by serving on College and University committees, advising student organizations, or organizing symposia and programs in their area of expertise.

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

Faculty may also provide service within the community as members or leaders in various organizations, by participating in volunteer activities, or through engagement in other ways that make a positive professional contribution. There should be evidence of excellence in service as reflected by the criteria examples listed in the Table 1 below. An individual may not demonstrate all of the objective criteria below; however, they should demonstrate substantial achievements in the majority of them.

<p><b>Table 1</b></p> <p><b>Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Tenure Track Associate Professor</b></p> <p><i>Please note that these are <u>not</u> intended to be a list of requirements but are examples of evidence candidates can provide to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Teaching Excellence Criterion</b></p> <p><b>Base Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Peer classroom evaluations (generally at or above unit average)</li><li>• Student Evaluation of Instructor scores (generally at or above unit average)</li><li>• Majority of external evaluation of teaching materials sent out for review and rating that are in support of promotion</li></ul>

- Recognition for mentoring/advising student research.
- Successful course and instructional program development and implementation
- Teaching awards given by Department, College, University and/or Professional Associations

**National Impact Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Continuing education lectures at state and national meetings
- Teaching awards
- Invited presentations or peer reviewed presentations
- Scholarship in Teaching
- Training grants or educational grants
- Authoring book chapters or books intended to be used for educational purposes

**Scholarship Excellence Criterion**

**Productivity Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- 12 peer-reviewed publications *or* 6 solo-authored original research articles (e.g., law review articles, original research articles in medical journals, target articles in a bioethics journal ,etc.) *or* a solo-authored scholarly peer reviewed monograph plus 3 peer reviewed publications *or* some combination of equivalent scholarly productivity since appointment as Tenure Track Assistant Professor\*
- Presented abstracts at local, regional or national meetings
- The development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media including social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics with appropriate documentation of impact such as Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate’s work using traditional and social media platforms will be considered works of scholarship by the department.

**Focus & Independence Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- 6 first or senior authored peer-reviewed publications, *or* one solo-authored peer reviewed scholarly monograph, *or* equivalent, since appointment as Tenure Track Assistant Professor\*
- The majority of publications, presentations and grants align with faculty member’s scholarship focus

**Sustainability Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- PI on 1 peer-reviewed nationally competitive extramural grants that support the faculty member’s scholarship across multiple years and/or equivalent philanthropy and educational program development *or* 20% FTE on external grants
- 2 submitted nationally competitive grants or contracts that are scored
- Co-I on multiple nationally competitive peer reviewed grants or contracts

including bioethics support on multiple grants that support the faculty member's scholarship across multiple years

- Patented products
- Participation in national training grants or contracts

**National Impact Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Invited local, regional & national presentations
- Number of citations or H index reflective of impact in field of scholarship concentration
- Publication in top journals in faculty member's area of scholarship
- Local, regional or national research awards and recognition
- Member of federal agency review panel for grants or contracts
- Major author or editor of books or chapters in the area of scholarship
- Entrepreneurial accomplishments linked to the scholarship such as patents, invention disclosures and similar reports

\* Where University programs provide conflicting guidelines regarding time periods for review of scholarship, e.g., The Provost's Tenure-Track Fellow to Faculty Program, University guidelines take precedence.

**Service Excellence Criterion**

**Base Evidence the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Elected or appointed offices for local, regional, or national professional societies related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Outreach and service-learning grants
- Service to promote diversity and anti-racism
- Participation in department, college, or university committees, task forces, and councils
- Participation in program planning, program accreditation or program outcome assessment
- Reviewer for 2 professional journals related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Journal Review Board member
- Grant review for university competitions or regional level competitions
- Consultation, patient care
- Participation in student service

**2. Promotion to Professor with Tenure**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:



*Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.*

For teaching, scholarship, and service, the same categories of activities listed as required for the associate professor apply for the promotion to Tenure Track Professor. Likewise, the same types of activities can be listed as evidence of excellence for both. The expectation is that the level of accomplishment will be consistent during the period after promotion to Tenure Track Associate Professor, such that productivity will have been sustained or increased since that promotion.

The criteria for promotion are divided into three categories that include teaching, scholarship, and service. The specifics of each of these criteria are outlined below.

Teaching:

- All criteria for Tenure Track Associate Professor apply
- Demonstrated excellence in post-professional or graduate teaching.
- National or international teaching excellence such as invited teaching for other departments, colleges, or universities

Scholarship:

- All criteria for Tenure Track Associate Professor apply
- Demonstrate a sustained record of peer-reviewed, nationally competitive funding for the program of scholarship
- Demonstrate sustained record of publication in national and international peer-reviewed journals in the faculty member's area of scholarship, with a substantial portion of those publications as first or senior author

Service:

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

Representative criterion for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to Tenure Track Professor include all of the criterion outlined in Table 1 for Promotion to Tenure Track Associate Professor as well as the following additional criteria examples outlined in Table 2. An individual may not demonstrate all the objective criteria below; however, they should demonstrate substantial achievements in the majority of them.

**Table 2**

**Criteria for Promotion to Tenure Track Professor**

*Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples of evidence candidates can provide to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.*

**Teaching Excellence Criterion**

**Base Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Professional, undergraduate, and/or graduate level advising awards or high ratings
- Professional, undergraduate, and/or graduate student success and awards
- Leadership in course development, curricular design, and program evaluation

**International Impact Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Presentations at national and international meetings or conferences
- Positive evaluations from national audiences
- Teaching awards given by Department, College, University and/or Professional Associations
- Invited national and international presentations
- Participation in training or educational grants
- Authoring books or book chapters

**Scholarship Excellence Criterion**

**Productivity Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- 12 peer reviewed publications *or* 6 solo-authored original research articles (e.g., peer reviewed law review articles, original research articles in medical journals, target articles in a bioethics journal, etc.) *or* a solo-authored peer reviewed scholarly monograph plus 3 peer reviewed publications *or* some combination of equivalent scholarly productivity since appointment as Tenure Track Associate Professor
- Presented abstracts at national and international meetings
- The development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media including social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics with appropriate documentation of impact such as Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate's work using traditional and social media platforms will be considered works of scholarship by the department.

**Focus & Independence Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- 4 first or senior authored peer-reviewed publications *or* one solo-authored peer reviewed scholarly monograph, *or* equivalent educational products since

appointment as Tenure Track Associate Professor

**Sustainability Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- PI on 2 peer-reviewed nationally competitive extramural grants that support the faculty member's scholarship across multiple years and/or equivalent philanthropy and educational program development *or* 30% FTE on external grants.
- Co-I on multiple nationally competitive peer reviewed grants or contracts including bioethics support on multiple grants that support the faculty member's scholarship across multiple years

**International Impact Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Invited national and international presentations
- National and international presentations at meetings
- National or international research awards and recognition

**Service Excellence Criterion**

**Base Evidence that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Elected or appointed offices for national and international professional societies related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Leadership roles in outreach and service-learning grants
- Service to promote the diversity and anti-racism mission of the College
- Editorial board member of professional journals related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Grant reviewer for national organization or federal agencies
- Leadership in patient care or consultation
- Leadership in student service organizations

### 3. Promotion of Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members, by definition, have a relatively greater responsibility for patient care, teaching --including instruction in the clinical setting -- and service. For this reason, the emphasis on traditional scholarship and external grant funding is less for clinical faculty than for tenure track faculty per college guidelines. Clinical faculty members are not eligible for tenure.

Clinical faculty may serve the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy, the College of Medicine and The Ohio State University without ever seeking promotion to the next higher faculty rank simply through repeated reappointment at the same rank. However, the goals and objectives of the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy, the College of Medicine and The Ohio State University are best met when all

faculty strive for continued improvement by meeting or exceeding the requirements for promotion to the next faculty rank.

In recognition of the varied contributions a faculty member with clinical responsibilities to further the mission of the College of Medicine, clinical faculty may be evaluated by two defined pathways as appropriate. These are the Clinician Educator Pathway and the Clinical Excellence Pathway. With the exception of the Clinical Excellence Pathway, the awarding of promotion to the rank of clinical associate professor must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor.

The criteria for promotion of clinical faculty on a regional campus are identical to those on the Columbus campus.

#### **a. Promotion from Clinical Instructor to Assistant Clinical Professor, Clinical Educator Pathway**

Appointments at the rank of Instructor are not renewable past the initial three-year appointment. A Clinical Instructor must show annual progress toward meeting or exceeding the criteria for promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor as outlined below. Promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor is based upon successful completion of the doctorate or other terminal degree and/or clinical credentials, and meeting or exceeding the criteria for appointment as an Assistant Clinical Professor. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms. Progress towards meeting these criteria will be the focus of the annual review and include:

##### Teaching

1. Teach assigned courses including periodic updating of content; supervise and /or coordinate lab/clinical/practice experiences
2. Have a record of excellence in teaching such as:
  - Receive consistently high-level evaluations of teaching performance by peers, students, administrators, consultants, and others
  - Receive recognition or awards for distinguished teaching and/or other educational accomplishments
  - Participate in the development of new courses or curricula
  - Publish material of an educational or instructional nature or give evidence of production of other forms of teaching materials (e.g., videotapes, computer programs, laboratory manuals)
  - Develop creative or innovative approaches to teaching e.g., problem-based learning, distance education, and service –learning courses

- Offer or direct continuing education programs for local, state, or national organizations
- Participate as an invited speaker at the state, regional or national level
- Demonstrate excellence in honors student advisement/education.

### Scholarship

1. Have a record of contributing to educational scholarship and productivity
  - Contributing authorship to peer-reviewed publications, review papers, books, book chapters, or case studies in educational scholarship
  - Contributing to grantsmanship in educational scholarship
  - Making local, regional, and national scholarly presentations in educational scholarship

### Service

1. Perform an equitable share of service and administrative tasks in compliance with department, college and university policies and procedures
2. Have a record of effective service such as:
  - Professional practice activities
  - Leadership in local, regional, or national professional organizations
  - Active contributions to, departmental, college and university student services
  - Outreach and diversity service
  - Program planning or program accreditation
  - Receive recognition for service at the departmental, college, university or professional levels

## **b. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Clinical Professor to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Educator Pathway**

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has established a national reputation and demonstrated an impact on the field of education through teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms. Since the appointment to the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor, the faculty member has:

1. Performed an equitable share of teaching, scholarship and service or administrative tasks in compliance with departmental, college and university policies and procedures.

2. Established a strong record of teaching excellence as demonstrated by consistent positive evaluations by students, external evaluators, and peers, which may include awards or other recognitions. In addition to teaching evaluations, the faculty member should demonstrate substantial impact on the teaching programs, which may include innovations or program development.
3. Demonstrated multiple contributions to educational scholarship as reflected by publication of case reports, book chapters, participation in grantsmanship, research projects or clinical trials, or contributions as contributing author on peer-reviewed journal publications, or presentations at local, regional and national professional meetings.
4. Established a record of leadership in service to the department, college, university, which may include active participation in professional societies, or other organizations relevant to the mission of the department.

Table 3 summarizes examples of metrics used to assess faculty for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor. An individual may not demonstrate all of the objective criteria below; however, they should demonstrate substantial achievements in the majority of them.

<p><b>Table 3</b></p> <p><b>Criteria for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Educator Pathway</b></p> <p><i>Please note that these are <u>not</u> intended to be a list of requirements but are examples of evidence candidates can provide to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. The contents of this table assume a standard workload distribution of 70% teaching, 20% scholarship, and 10% service. Where a faculty member has a different workload distribution, expectations should be adjusted as appropriate.</i></p>
<p><b>Teaching Excellence Criterion</b></p> <p><b>Base Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer classroom evaluations (generally at or above unit average)</li> <li>• Student Evaluation of Instructor scores (generally at or above unit average)</li> <li>• Majority of external evaluation of teaching materials sent out for review and rating that are in support of promotion</li> <li>• Recognition of mentoring/advising undergraduate students, graduate students and instructors.</li> <li>• Successful course and instructional program development and implementation</li> <li>• Teaching awards</li> </ul>

**Clinical Education Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met (if applicable)**

- Peer evaluations of clinical education (generally at or above unit average)
- Student evaluation of clinical education (generally at or above unit average)
- External evaluation by affiliated clinical sites that are in support of promotion
- Recognition for mentoring/advising of clinical preceptors
- Recognition for or development of an innovative clinical education programs
- Recruitment and/or retention of clinical faculty and sites

**National Impact Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Continuing education lectures at state, regional or national meetings
- Teaching awards given by Department, College, University or Professional Associations
- Invited local, regional and/or national presentations or peer reviewed presentations

**Scholarship Excellence Criterion**

**Productivity Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Total of 6 or more peer-reviewed publications or equivalent educational products (i.e.: books, book chapters, electronic educational resources), *or* 3 solo-authored original research articles (e.g., law review articles, original research articles in medical journals, or target articles in a bioethics journal, etc.) *or* a solo authored peer-reviewed scholarly monograph *or* some combination of equivalent scholarly productivity, since appointment as Assistant Clinical Professor
- The development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media including social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics with appropriate documentation of impact such as Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate's work using traditional and social media platforms will be considered works of scholarship by the department.
- Presented abstracts at local, regional and national meetings

**Focus & Independence Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- 3 first or senior authored peer-reviewed publications, *or* one solo-authored peer reviewed scholarly monograph, *or* equivalent educational products, since appointment as Assistant Clinical Professor
- The majority of publications, presentations and grants align with faculty member's scholarship focus

**Sustainability Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Ongoing funded position within a program of sustainable scholarship
- Co-I on nationally competitive peer reviewed grants or contracts including

bioethics support on multiple grants that support the faculty member's scholarship across multiple years

- Patented products
- Federal training grant participation

**National Impact Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Invited local, regional and national presentations
- Publication in top journals in faculty member's area of scholarship
- Local, regional or national scholarship awards and recognition
- Member of federal/national agency review panel for grants or contracts
- Major author or editor of books or chapters in the area of scholarship
- Federal/national training grant participation

**Service Excellence Criterion**

**Base Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Elected or appointed offices for national professional societies related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Leadership roles in outreach and service-learning grants
- Service to promote diversity and anti-racism
- Reviewer for 2 professional and scientific journals
- Grant reviewer for local, regional or national organizations
- Leadership in patient care or consultation
- Leadership in student service organizations

**c. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Clinical Professor to Clinical Professor, Clinical Educator Pathway**

Promotion to Clinical Professor must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has established a national and international reputation and demonstrated an impact on the field of education through teaching, scholarship and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms. Since the appointment to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor, the faculty member has:

1. Performed an equitable share of teaching, scholarship and service or administrative tasks in compliance with departmental, college and university policies and procedures.
2. A sustained record of excellence in teaching as demonstrated by consistent positive evaluations by students, external peers, and peers. Candidates for promotion to professor should also demonstrate accomplishment in educational leadership as reflected by development of courses or programs, or other educational innovations.



3. A sustained record of leadership in educational scholarship as reflected by multiple publications such as case reports, book chapters, books, participation in grants, research projects, philosophical, bioethical and conceptual analysis or clinical trials, or contributions as a contributing author on peer-reviewed journal publications.
4. A sustained record of leadership in service to the Department, College, University and Profession, which may include national professional societies or other national organizations relevant to the mission of the department.

Table 4 summarizes examples of metrics used to assess faculty for promotion to Clinical Professor. An individual may not demonstrate all of the objective criteria below; however, they should demonstrate substantial achievements in the majority of them.

<p><b>Table 4</b></p> <p><b>Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Professor, Clinical Educator Pathway</b></p> <p><i>Please note that these are <u>not</u> intended to be a list of requirements but are examples of evidence candidates can provide to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. The contents of this table assume a workload distribution of 70% teaching, 20% scholarship, and 10% service. Where a faculty member has a different workload distribution, expectations should be adjusted as appropriate.</i></p>
<p><b>Teaching Excellence Criterion</b></p> <p><b>Base Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer classroom evaluations (generally at or above unit average)</li> <li>• Student Evaluation of Instructor scores (generally at or above unit average)</li> <li>• Professional and graduate level advising awards or high ratings</li> <li>• Professional and graduate student success and awards</li> <li>• Leadership in course development, curricular design and program evaluation</li> </ul> <p><b>Clinical Education Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met (if applicable)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer evaluations of clinical education (generally at or above unit average)</li> <li>• Student evaluation of clinical education (generally at or above unit average)</li> <li>• External evaluation by affiliated clinical sites that are in support of promotion</li> <li>• Recognition for mentoring/advising of clinical preceptors</li> <li>• Recognition for or development of an innovative clinical education programs</li> <li>• Recruitment and/or retention of clinical faculty and sites</li> </ul> <p><b>International Impact Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentations at national and international meetings or conferences</li> <li>• Positive teaching evaluations from national audiences</li> </ul>

- Teaching awards given by Department, College, University and/or Professional Associations
- Invited national and international presentations
- Participation in training or educational grants
- Authoring books or book chapters

### **Scholarship Excellence Criterion**

#### **Productivity Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Total of 6 or more peer-reviewed publications or equivalent educational products (i.e.: books, book chapters, electronic educational resources), *or* 3 solo-authored original research articles (e.g., law review articles, original research articles in medical journals, or target articles in a bioethics journal, etc.) *or* a solo authored peer-reviewed scholarly monograph *or* some combination of equivalent scholarly productivity, since appointment as Associate Clinical Professor.
- The development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media including social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics with appropriate documentation of impact such as Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate's work using traditional and social media platforms will be considered works of scholarship by the department.
- Presented abstracts at national and international meetings

#### **Focus & Independence Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- 3 first or senior authored peer-reviewed publications, *or* one solo-authored peer reviewed scholarly monograph, *or* equivalent educational products, since appointment as Associate Clinical Professor
- Publication in books or journals with an impact at the national and international level.
- A majority of publications, presentations or grants align with candidate's scholarship focus

#### **Sustainability Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Co-I on peer-reviewed nationally competitive extramural grants, contracts, foundations or private funding sources including bioethics support that support the faculty member's scholarship across multiple years
- Patented products
- Participating member of training or programmatic grants or contracts

#### **International Impact Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Invited national and international presentations
- National and international presentations at meetings
- Publication in preeminent journals for faculty member's area of expertise

- National or international education scholarship awards
- Invited to a review panel or editorial board for a journal in faculty member's area of expertise
- Major author or editor of books or chapters in the area of faculty member's area of expertise

**Service Excellence Criterion**

**Base Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Elected or appointed offices for national and international professional societies related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Leadership roles in outreach and service-learning grants
- Service to promote diversity and anti-racism
- Participation in College or University committees, task forces and councils
- Leadership role in program development, program accreditation or program outcome assessment
- Editorial board member of professional journals related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Grant reviewer for national or international organization or federal agencies
- Leadership in patient care or consultation
- Leadership in student service organizations

**d. Promotion from Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway**

Appointments at the rank of Instructor are not renewable past the initial three-year appointment. A Clinical Instructor must show annual progress toward meeting or exceeding the criteria for promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor as outlined below. Promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor is based upon successful completion of the doctorate or other terminal degree and/or clinical credentials, and meeting or exceeding the criteria for appointment as an Assistant Clinical Professor. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms. When an individual is appointed as an instructor, the letter of offer will 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. When an instructor meets the criteria for promotion to assistant professor on the clinical faculty, a new letter of offer with a probationary period of five years will be issued. In the event the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

#### **e. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Clinical Professor to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway**

In the circumstance where individuals are assigned major responsibilities (80% or greater of their FTE at OSU/NCH) for clinical care, clinical administrative activities, and other activities related to their defined area of clinical expertise, faculty members may seek promotion on the clinical excellence pathway. Major responsibility is defined as 80% time dedicated to the clinical mission. Exceptions to the 80% may be granted by the chair in isolated circumstances.

The clinical time commitment of these individuals may not allow the achievement of personal recognition for their accomplishments; however, their unique contributions serve to enhance the recognition of the Medical Center, the Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy, or their assigned clinical team. These faculty are recognized for the scholarship of clinical practice or novel contributions to the advancement of the practice in their field. For these individuals, their contribution to the regional and national recognition of the Medical Center or University may serve as a proxy for individual regional or national recognition. Personal National recognition is not required for Promotion.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor on the Clinical Excellence Pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has demonstrated a level of excellence and a record of impact beyond the usual physician's scope or sphere of influence. Promotion will not be granted purely on the basis of length of service to the institution, clinical productivity, or satisfactory job performance. A faculty member who qualifies for promotion on this pathway should have supportive annual evaluations that document clinical effort in the years leading up to promotion on this pathway.

On the Clinical Excellence pathway, there must be individual evidence and a continued trajectory of high-quality patient care, which may include subjective and objective markers such as clinical quality metrics; recognition from patients, colleagues, or other team members; letters of support from colleagues; teaching awards; student and resident evaluations; or departmental and other clinical awards. Peer evaluation of teaching is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members. Teaching evaluations may be based on presentations internally or at other academic institutions, bedside teaching scores, presentations or tutorials at scientific conferences or meetings, or presentations at other medical centers or hospitals.

As with all applications for promotion, letters of review are required. These may be from internal reviewers who are familiar with the candidate's work, regional experts who are

aware of the candidate’s work, reputation and who may have referred and comanaged patients with the candidate. Letters from outside experts are also appropriate as for other pathways. The nature of the reviewers may differ from the usual expert reviewers who are remote professionally and often geographically distant from the candidate. The careers of these experts will differ from the external reviewers in other pathways in being characterized by excellence in patient care rather than a history of scholarly publications or grant funding. Local experts may include colleagues from another health center and can include non-academic institutions. Evaluation of local expert clinicians from inside the University (The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center or Nationwide Children’s Hospital) is permitted but restricted to colleagues outside the candidate’s division. Reviewers should be at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires (on a limited basis, reviewers below the aspired rank will be accepted though these are not required.)

The metrics for such a promotion will vary according to position, focus of clinical expertise, and workload. Therefore, it is understood that there is an inherent flexibility in our review criteria and such promotions are determined on a case-by-case basis.

There should be clear, sustained evidence demonstrating an expertise and reputation to our organization outside of the expected clinical work of a member of a clinical ethics consultation service and a continued trajectory of accomplishments. This may include clinical innovation or program development. The candidate must present a portfolio with acceptable and favorable accomplishments as outlined in the example areas below. The documentation and demonstration of outcomes or impact is required. It is not expected that candidates will meet all of the examples below, but meeting only one will not satisfy the demonstration of collective impact of excellence.

<p><b>Table 5</b></p> <p><b>Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway</b></p> <p><i>Please note that these are <u>not</u> a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Teaching Excellence Criterion</b></p> <p>Not required, although participation in teaching and mentoring of trainees and early career faculty is valued and may be included</p> <p><b>Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership in educational programs, curriculum development, program development, mentoring learners, continuing education and innovation in education are considered examples of excellence in teaching.</li> </ul>

- Educational awards.
- Learner evaluations.
- Peer evaluation of instruction.

**Scholarship/Creative Works/Research Excellence Criterion**

Not required, although participation in scholarly activity is valued and may be included

**Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Publications, written reports, peer reviewed research papers are considered examples of excellence in scholarship.
- Grant funding.
- Scholarship/Creative Works/Research Awards.
- Designing or supervising the construction of creative products or research investigations.

**Service Excellence Criterion**

Not required, although participation in service is valued and may be included

**Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Committee service at the department, college and University level are considered examples of excellence in service.
- Local regional and national committee/board service.
- Leadership in local, regional and national organizations.
- Service Awards
- Professional expertise extended to public and private entities in the community
- Creation and/or implementation of programs that serve the greater community

**Clinical Performance Excellence Criterion**

**Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Demonstration of impact or excellence in clinical performance and/or clinical administration is the hallmark of the clinical excellence pathway and is *required*.
- Multiple lines of evidence supporting excellence in clinical performance, including discipline relevant clinical measures such as, but not limited to quality indicators, process improvements, reduction in health disparities, and improvements in community health outcomes where performance measures can easily be internally and externally benchmarked for comparison. Clinical productivity metrics per se, are not sufficient for supporting excellence in clinical performance.

- Clinical program development. Evidence that a faculty member has developed a new program or led improvements in an existing program and that subsequent to those innovations the success of the program has materially improved, or the program has been duplicated or adopted within the medical center or by other institutions or practices. Programs that involve collaborative efforts and improve cultural competence of or access to equitable healthcare and promote diversity, equity and inclusion are particularly valued.
- A record that demonstrates the faculty member has been invited to lecture locally, regionally or at other hospitals, academic medical centers, or statewide professional societies.
- A record that demonstrates that a faculty member is frequently consulted by physicians from outside the OSU system for advice about patient care. This can be in the form of traditional peer-peer consultation, however, TIUs should consider using flexibility in assessing media/social media-related consultation methods (e.g. WhatsApp, email etc.)
- Evidence that a faculty member has developed clinical innovations that have been adopted by other physicians within or outside the medical center.
- Evidence the faculty member participates as an instructor or is involved with the development of education activities at local or state levels that are in person, virtual, or web based.
- Evidence that physicians from other medical centers come to OSU/NCH specifically for training by the faculty member, or request proctoring at their home institution by the faculty member.
- Receipt of awards from local, state, national organizations for clinical excellence.
- Participation in the development of institutional or statewide practice guidelines.
- Operational improvements that make practice more efficient, effective, easier to access, or more cost effective.
- Evidence for development of programs to identify healthcare disparities or programmatic changes to advance equitable healthcare delivery.
- Evidence of the faculty member's efforts and participation in programs supporting the clinical mission by improving workforce diversity, promoting inclusion of diverse talent and creating an equitable workplace, in alignment with the mission of the university and COM e.g. work done to improve pathway programs for URiM (Underrepresented in Medicine) or developing programs to enhance education and improve culture of acceptance in the workplace.

## **f. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Clinical Professor to Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway**

Continued recognition of sustained clinical excellence by patients, team members and others and a continued trajectory of sustained excellence is an expectation of the candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor on the Clinical Excellence Pathway as per Table 6.

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Professor on the Clinical Excellence Pathway should demonstrate that the candidate has meaningfully contributed to the national reputation of the medical center or individually achieved a sustained national reputation as an excellent clinician. These contributions will have a sustained positive impact on patient care and require more advanced and sustained quantity, quality and impact than that required for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor on the Clinical Excellence Pathway.

This level of excellence should be supported by letters of attestation to the faculty's work product/effort/excellence, either through their individual patient care or as it pertains to the reputation of the medical center, by those outside of the Department who can speak to the clinician's impact. These may include faculty in other departments, nursing leadership, community outreach, financial directors and others. Promotion will not be granted purely on the bases of length of service to the institution or satisfactory job performance.

Metrics such as state, or national recognition for clinical excellence and innovation are clear indicators of individual achievement; however, due to the unique and team-based nature of the care provided by clinical ethics consult services, an individual's contributions that result in recognition of the entire department or the medical system constitute another mechanism of demonstrating impact.

Additional metrics of national recognition include invited national lectures regarding innovation, program development and clinical excellence, recruitment/invitation on national committees focused on clinical care, and leadership at a national level. Development, facilitation, or oversight of policies, programs, or procedures that result in improvements for patient outcomes, more efficient or value-based care, or more effective means of delivering care may support promotion on this pathway, if they are demonstrated to enhance the reputation of the department and the medical center.

Mentoring of junior faculty/trainees is essential for the promotion to Professor on any pathway, including Clinical Excellence. Given the unique nature of the Clinical Excellence pathway mentoring should be interpreted broadly including but not limited to career advising, faculty development assistance, clinical improvement assistance, advising junior



faculty on mechanics of fulfilling their positions, or leadership recruitment/training to ensure sustained success of innovative or novel clinical improvement programs.

**Table 6**

**Criteria for Promotion to Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway**

*Please note that these are not a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.*

**Teaching Excellence Criterion**

Not required, although participation in teaching and mentoring of trainees and early career faculty is valued and may be included

**Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- National leadership in educational programs, curriculum development, program development, mentoring learners, continuing education and innovation in education are considered examples of excellence in teaching.
- University/National/Society Educational awards.
- Learner evaluations.
- Peer evaluation of instruction.

**Scholarship/Creative Works/Research Excellence Criterion**

Not required, although participation scholarly activity is valued and may be included

**Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Publications, written reports, peer reviewed research papers are considered examples of excellence in scholarship.
- Grant funding.
- Scholarship/Creative Works/Research Awards.
- Designing or supervising the construction of creative products or research investigations that impact the field nationally

**Service Excellence Criterion**

Not required, although participation scholarly activity is valued and may be included

**Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Committee service at the department, college and University level are considered examples of excellence in service.

- National committee/board service.
- Leadership in national organizations.
- Service Awards
- Professional expertise extended to public and private entities in the community
- Creation and/or implementation of programs that serve the greater community

### **Clinical Performance Excellence Criterion**

#### **Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Demonstration of broad impact or excellence in clinical performance and/or clinical administration is the hallmark of the clinical excellence pathway and is *required*.
- Multiple lines of evidence supporting excellence in clinical performance, including discipline relevant clinical measures such as, but not limited to quality indicators, process improvements, reduction in health disparities, and improvements in community health outcomes where performance measures can easily be internally and externally benchmarked for comparison. Clinical productivity metrics per se, are not sufficient for supporting excellence in clinical performance.
- Clinical program development that has national impact through adaption. Evidence that a faculty member has developed a new program or led improvements in an existing program and that subsequent to those innovations the success of the program has materially improved, or the program has been duplicated or adopted within the medical center or by other institutions or practices. Programs that involve collaborative efforts and improve cultural competence of or access to equitable healthcare and promote diversity, equity and inclusion are particularly valued.
- A record that demonstrates the faculty member has been invited to lecture regionally, nationally or at other hospitals, academic medical centers, or statewide professional societies.
- A record that demonstrates that a faculty member is frequently consulted by physicians from outside the OSU system for advice about patient care. This can be in the form of traditional peer-peer consultation, however, TIUs should consider using flexibility in assessing media/social media-related consultation methods (e.g. WhatsApp, email etc.)
- Evidence that a faculty member has developed clinical innovations that have been adopted by other physicians outside the medical center.
- Evidence the faculty member participates as an instructor or is involved with the development of education activities at local or state levels that are in person, virtual, or web based.
- Evidence that physicians from other medical centers come to OSU/NCH specifically for training by the faculty member, or request proctoring at their home institution by the faculty member.

- Receipt of awards from state, national organizations for clinical excellence.
- Participation in the development of institutional, statewide or national practice guidelines.
- Operational improvements that make practice more efficient, effective, easier to access, or more cost effective.
- Evidence for development of programs to identify healthcare disparities or programmatic changes to advance equitable healthcare delivery.
- Evidence of the faculty member's efforts and participation in programs supporting the clinical mission by improving workforce diversity, promoting inclusion of diverse talent and creating an equitable workplace, in alignment with the mission of the university and COM e.g. work done to improve pathway programs for URiM (Underrepresented in Medicine) or developing programs to enhance education and improve culture of acceptance in the workplace.

#### **4. Promotion of Research Faculty**

The criteria for promotion of Research Faculty are identical to those for Tenure Track Faculty, with two important exceptions. First, there is no expectation for excellence in teaching for Research Faculty. Promotion will be made principally on excellence and productivity in scholarship/research. The second difference is that a higher level of productivity and impact in scholarship/research will be required of Research Faculty. Research Faculty have no teaching expectation and will normally have scholarship/research time in the 90 – 100% range, about twice that of a Tenure Track Faculty members in the Department. Therefore, the Research Faculty member should have about twice the productivity of the Tenure Track Faculty member. A consistent record of extramural funding through grants, contracts, foundation monies or private monies that provides significant salary support is expected for promotion of research faculty.

The research faculty member will also be expected to have a record of service aligned with the program of scholarship/research, such as service in reviewing for journals, granting or contract agencies.

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

##### **a. Criteria for Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor**

The overarching standard for promotion to a Research Associate Professor will be a local, regional and national reputation and impact for the faculty member’s program of scholarship/research. Criterion examples for promotion to a Research Associate Professor are outlined in Table 7 below. An individual may not demonstrate all of the objective criteria below; however, they should demonstrate substantial achievements in the majority of them.

<b>Table 7</b> <b>Criteria for Promotion to Research Associate Professor</b> <i>Please note that these are <u>not</u> intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for evidence candidates can provide to demonstrate they meet promotion criteria. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.</i>	
<b>Teaching Excellence Criterion</b>  <b>None Expected</b>	
	<b>Scholarship Excellence Criterion</b>
	<p><b>Productivity Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total of 24 peer-reviewed publications or equivalent educational products (i.e.: books, book chapters, electronic educational resources) since appointment as Research Assistant Professor</li> <li>• Presented abstracts at local, regional or national meetings</li> </ul> <p><b>Focus &amp; Independence Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 first or senior authored peer-reviewed publications or equivalent educational products since appointment as Research Assistant Professor</li> <li>• The majority of publications, presentations and grants align with faculty member’s scholarship focus</li> </ul> <p><b>Sustainability Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PI on 1 peer-reviewed nationally competitive extramural grants that support the faculty member’s scholarship across multiple years</li> <li>• PI on 1 nationally competitive contract that support the faculty member’s scholarship across multiple years</li> <li>• Co-I on multiple nationally competitive peer reviewed grants or contracts that support the faculty member’s scholarship across multiple years</li> <li>• Patented products</li> <li>• Participation in national training grants or contracts</li> </ul> <p><b>National Impact Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invited local, regional &amp; national presentations</li> <li>• Number of citations or H index</li> <li>• Publication in top journals in faculty member’s area of scholarship</li> </ul>

- Local, regional or national research awards and recognition
- Member of federal agency review panel for grants or contracts
- Major author or editor of books or chapters in the area of scholarship
- Entrepreneurial accomplishments linked to the scholarship such as patents, invention disclosures and similar reports

**Service Excellence Criterion**

**Base Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Elected or appointed offices for local, regional or national professional societies related to the faculty member’s scholarship
- Participation in scholarship-based departmental, College and University committees (i.e. IACUC, IRB, etc.)
- Participation in outreach and service-learning grants
- Reviewer for 2 professional journals related to the faculty member’s scholarship
- Grant or contract review for local, regional or national organizations
- Participation in student service organizations
- Service to promote diversity and anti-racism

**b. Criteria for Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor**

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Research Professor must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the faculty member has developed a national or international leadership role and level of impact or recognition. As with promotion to Research Associate Professor, the criteria for promotion to Research Professor are the same as for Tenure Track Faculty at similar rank, with two exceptions. First, excellence in teaching is not required. Second, promotion will be based principally on excellence in scholarship/research. A higher level of productivity and impact in scholarship/research is required. Service activities should be minimal and related to the program of scholarship/research. Criterion examples for promotion to a Research Associate Professor are outlined in Table 8 below. An individual may not demonstrate all of the objective criteria below; however, they should demonstrate substantial achievements in the majority of them.

**Table 8**

**Criteria for Promotion to Research Professor**

*Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples of evidence candidates can provide to demonstrate they meet criteria for promotion. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.*

**Teaching Excellence Criterion**

- **None Expected**

**Scholarship Excellence Criterion**

**Productivity Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Total of 36 peer reviewed publications or equivalent with at least 12 since appointment as Research Associate Professor
- Presented abstracts at national and international meetings

**Focus & Independence Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- 10 first or senior authored peer-reviewed publications or equivalent since appointment as Research Associate Professor

**Sustainability Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- PI on 2 peer-reviewed nationally competitive extramural grants that support the faculty member's scholarship across multiple years
- PI on 2 nationally competitive contracts that support the faculty member's scholarship across multiple years

**International Impact Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Invited national and international presentations
- National and international presentations at meetings
- National or international research awards and recognition

**Service Excellence Criterion**

**Base Evidence Showing that the Criterion Has Been Met**

- Elected or appointed offices for national and international professional societies related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Leadership roles in outreach and service-learning grants
- Service to promote diversity and anti-racism
- Editorial board member of professional journals related to the faculty member's scholarship
- Grant reviewer for national organization or federal agencies
- Leadership in student service organizations
- Service to promote diversity and anti-racism

**5. Associated Faculty**

**Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor.** The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above.

**Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50%.** The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

**Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor of Practice and Clinical Professor of Practice.** The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated clinical practice faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of clinical faculty above.

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer.** Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.4.

**Promotion of Visiting Faculty.** Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

## **6. Regional Campus Faculty**

In evaluating regional campus clinical faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of clinical faculty.

### **B. Procedures**

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for Tenure Track Faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for Clinical Faculty, [3335-7-32](#) for Research Faculty, and with the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

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

The Department of Biomedical Education and Anatomy is comprised of several professional disciplines. Care must be taken to apply the criteria for appointment and promotion with sufficient flexibility. In all instances, outstanding accomplishment in accordance with the criteria set forth is an essential qualification for appointment and promotion to all faculty positions. Insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for the maintenance and enhancement of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

## **1. Tenure Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

### **a. Candidate Responsibilities**

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

#### **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#). Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs [Candidate Checklist](#) without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

While the Eligible Faculty Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him/her/them.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and



relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

The following paragraphs provide standards for documenting excellence in Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service.

### **Teaching**

Teaching is defined as imparting knowledge, experience, insight, and skill to other persons. In this department teaching must be consistently effective and of high quality. All Tenure Track and Clinical faculty members must be engaged in teaching, development of the Department's and College's academic programs, and mentoring of students, residents and fellows. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated by documentation of teaching activities over a sustained period of time. Yearly, student evaluations, resident & fellow evaluations (when applicable) and peer evaluations, at a minimum, are required.

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

Typical documentation of teaching for the promotion dossier will include:

- cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every formal class
- Medical student evaluations (e.g., Vitals)
- Resident evaluations (e.g., MedHub)
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (see Section IX of this document)
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
- involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
- mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
- extension and continuing education instruction
- involvement in curriculum development
- awards and formal recognition of teaching
- presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
- adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

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

Responsibility for arranging for and carrying out peer review activities must rest with someone other than the faculty member whose teaching or teaching materials are to be reviewed.

Peer evaluation of teaching may occur in many different venues, as applicable to a faculty member's primary teaching responsibility including undergraduate, graduate, professional students, residents and fellows. The peer evaluation should focus on such issues as the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment of tools and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current discipline knowledge. At the conclusion of the evaluation, the reviewer will provide the candidate with feedback and submit a written report to the division director and/or department chair, copied to the candidate. Written response by the candidate and reviewer may be included in this report.

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

Each probationary Tenure Track Faculty member shall also document at least one external evaluation of teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, examinations, and handouts) for one or more courses prior to the sixth-year review. The external evaluation must be arranged, carried out, and received by the Division/Unit Director or Department Chair. The Division/Unit Director or Department Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, should select colleagues outside of the University who have considerable content expertise. When possible, the peer evaluator should hold a rank equal to or higher than the faculty member being evaluated. Course materials are sent to this individual, and they will be asked to provide a narrative summary of the quality of the materials and the learning experience as represented by these materials. Consultation for conducting external evaluation of teaching is available from the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#). The evaluation summary is returned to the Division/Unit Director or Department Chair, who shares it with the faculty member and submits it to the Committee of Eligible Faculty for inclusion in the dossier.

## **Scholarship**

Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge by research, study, and learning. Scholarship includes all aspects of basic science, bioethical, clinical research including clinical trials and research based on cases or case series, educational outcomes research, legal and policy briefs, development of academic modules, entrepreneurship, theoretical inquiry, etc.

Evidence of scholarship can include but are not limited to: peer reviewed journal articles, law review journal, bulletins and technical reports, original books and monographs, edited books, chapters in edited books, editor reviewed journal articles, reviews and abstracts, papers in proceedings, unpublished scholarly presentations, externally funded research, funded training grants, other funding for academic work, prizes and awards for research or scholarly or creative work, major professional awards and commendations. Evidence of scholarship may also include invited lectures at other universities, symposia, and conferences;

invention disclosures, patent activity, entrepreneurship, technology commercialization, software development; editorship of a major collection of research work; leadership of advanced seminars and symposia under organizational sponsorship; and invitations to serve on national review bodies. Departments are encouraged to develop innovative ways of defining and measuring scholarship unique to their specific discipline.

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

## **Service**

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the division, department, college and university as well as exemplary patient care, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Service contributions must be demonstrated to be of high quality and effectiveness. All tenure track and clinical faculty members must contribute to service as evidenced by documentation of contributions over a sustained period of time.

Evidence of administrative service to the University may include appointment or election to division, department, College and/or University committees, holding administrative positions; development of innovative programs, and participating in mentoring activities. Program Development, reflecting the integration of teaching, service and research in a specific content area, may be given special recognition and significance. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include editorships of, or service as, a reviewer for journals or other learned publications; offices held and other service to professional societies. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University includes service as a reviewer of grants or other scholarly proposals, external examiner or advisor, a panel and commission participant, as professional consultant to industry, government, and education and community service directly relating to the division/department's goals and mission statement. While provision of high-quality patient care is expected of all faculty members with clinical responsibilities, in and of itself it is

insufficient for meeting the service requirement for tenure track and clinical faculty.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of teaching is forwarded along with the dossier. The documentation of scholarship and service is for use during the departmental review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

### **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document**

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion or reappointment (for clinical and research faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available [here](#), a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

### **External Evaluations** (see also External Evaluations below)

As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to departmental guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

### **b. Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities**

The chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty shall be a tenured faculty member recommended by the members of the committee and appointed by the chair of the

department. The chair of the committee serves a two-year term. The responsibilities of the Eligible Faculty Committee are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary clinical and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
- **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).

- Late Spring: The Eligible Faculty Committee chair will show the candidate the list of potential evaluators developed by the eligible faculty committee to identify any collaborators, conflicts of interest, or other issues that could interfere with the objectivity of the reviews, and be invited to augment it with no more than three names of persons who meet the criteria for objective, credible, evaluators.
- Late Spring: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these list.
- **Summer:** Gather internal evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service from students and peers, as appropriate.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her/their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- To establish a mechanism for each candidate's dossier to be accessible for review by the eligible faculty (e.g., secure website) at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit or is a member of a Discovery Theme.

- Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
- The evaluation by the eligible faculty is not advisory, but rather represents an independent review.
- The Eligible Faculty Committee chair will write a letter to the department chair reporting the vote and summarizing the discussion of the eligible faculty. This letter will be evaluative as well as descriptive and contextualize the vote, including any “minority opinions” as appropriate. In the event the candidate is on the tenure track, this letter must be written by a tenured faculty at the appropriate rank.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department’s recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department’s cases.

### **c. Department Chair Responsibilities**

In the event that the Department Chair is on the Clinical faculty, and therefore ineligible to conduct the promotion evaluation of a tenure track candidate for promotion, the Department must appoint or otherwise designate a tenured faculty member who can provide the chair level review. For review of candidates being considered for promotion to professor, that designee must be a tenured professor. The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors,



the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.

- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Eligible Faculty Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the departmental review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;

- of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair; and
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he/she/they will submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
  - To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline of November 1.
  - To receive the Eligible Faculty's Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

## **2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Adjunct faculty, associated faculty with tenure-track titles, and associated clinical faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases).

## **3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty**

The department has regional campus clinical faculty. The responsibilities of regional campus candidates are the same as those of a Columbus campus candidate as described above. These faculty members are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean/director and the department chair.

#### **4. External Evaluations**

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs:

##### **ANATOMY**

Peer:

University of Michigan

Indiana University

Penn State University

University of Minnesota

University of Wisconsin

Aspirational:

Harvard University

Johns Hopkins University

University of California

University of Pennsylvania

Georgetown University

##### **BIOETHICS**

Peer:

Saint Louis University

Case Western Reserve University

Georgetown University

Vanderbilt University

Duke University

Johns Hopkins University

Aspirational:

Saint Louis University (PhD program)

University of Pennsylvania (postdoc program)

The MacLean Center for Clinical Medical Ethics

University of Notre Dame Center for Ethics and Culture

Oxford Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics

Harvard University

##### **BIOMEDICAL EDUCATION**

Peer:

University of Michigan

Indiana University

Penn State University

University of Minnesota

University of Wisconsin

University of Cincinnati  
Washington University in St. Louis  
University of Iowa

Aspirational:  
Harvard University  
Johns Hopkins University  
University of California  
University of Pennsylvania  
Georgetown University

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion and/or tenure reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track faculty promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research faculty appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a clinical or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Eligible Faculty Committee.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Eligible Faculty Committee, the Department Chair, and the candidate. Candidates are permitted to suggest external evaluator names following the criteria below. However, per Faculty Rule [3335-06-04 \(B\) 3](#), “no more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate.”

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer’s objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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

- a) Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator (no shared publications in the last five years, unless part of a very large multi-centered project with a large number of authors), or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the scholarly work. This department will solicit evaluations only from individuals with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. They must be at the rank above the candidate being considered unless an exception has been granted by the college. It is therefore essential that the individual or body generating the list of prospective evaluators ascertain the relationship of prospective evaluators with the candidate before seeking a letter of evaluation. Candidates must be provided the opportunity to propose potential external reviewers and to review the proposed list of reviewers to identify potential conflicts.
- b) Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.
- c) In the event that the department is unable to obtain the required five external evaluations, it must document its efforts, noting the individuals who were contacted, how they were contacted, and the dates and number of times they were contacted. The department is to notify the college as soon as it becomes apparent that it will not be able to obtain the required letters in time for the meeting of the eligible faculty. The lack of five external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, Eligible Faculty Committee Chair, and the department chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and agree that it will not constitute a procedural error.

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

result from the first round of requests. Templates for the solicitation of external letters of evaluation for faculty in the College of Medicine may be found [here](#).

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

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

## **VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals**

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of clinical or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

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

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

## **VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) 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 (mandatory tenure) review.

## **IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

### **A. Student Evaluation**

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

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

Courses such as independent study, practicums, seminars etc. may not be amenable to evaluation using the SEI and, therefore, evaluations are not required for these courses. When alternative evaluation instruments are selected, they should be used consistently.

### **B. Peer Evaluation**

Systematic peer evaluation of teaching is required. The department adheres to the following general schedule of peer evaluations:

- a review of the teaching of probationary tenure-track, clinical, and associated faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- a review of the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary associate clinical professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.

- a review of the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary clinical professors at least once every other year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.

Upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member when there is low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

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

Peer evaluations can be formative or summative. Formative peer evaluation is arranged by the faculty member or the Division/Unit Director or Department Chair. The peer evaluator can provide written and verbal feedback to the faculty member. The results are used internally by the faculty member for improvement. If the faculty member chooses to do so, the formative evaluation can be included in the dossier as an example of the candidate's efforts and interest in improving their teaching. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Summative peer evaluation is arranged by the Division/Unit Director or Department Chair and results in an evaluative letter placed in the candidate's dossier. For summative peer evaluation, classroom observation should include multiple visits to the classroom, the completion of an evaluation instrument such as that provided by the University for Faculty Council, and a narrative summary of the findings by the evaluator. When possible, summative peer evaluation shall be carried out by a Faculty Member with a rank equal to higher than that of the faculty member being evaluated. The summative report must be submitted to the Division/Unit Director or Department Chair.

Whether for formative or summative evaluation, the peer evaluation process should begin with a discussion between the evaluator and the faculty member regarding the teaching



goals and plan for the sessions to be observed. Classroom observation should include assessment of student interest and response, as well as the instructor's style, organization, ability to explain complex ideas, interaction, eye contact, body language, content, and synthesis.

## X. Appendix

### A. Required Submission Items

- a) Fourth and Eighth-Year Review (Tenure-track):
  - Dossier cover sheet ([OAA form 109](#))
  - Dossier in Vita format
  - Vote of the eligible faculty and letter from Eligible Faculty Committee Chair
  - Chair's recommendation
  - Annual Evaluations
- b) Reappointment Review (Clinical or Research faculty):
  - Dossier cover sheet ([OAA form 109](#))
  - CV or Vita dossier
  - \*Vote of eligible faculty and letter from Eligible Faculty Committee Chair (\*only for probationary clinical & research faculty or in cases where Chair's decision is to not reappoint the faculty)
  - Chair's recommendation with term length
- c) Tenure-track Promotion and/or Tenure (\*attach one Form [110](#) per department):
  - Complete Vita dossier with all OAA forms (i.e. [105](#), [106](#), [109](#), [114](#))
  - Vote of the eligible faculty and letter from Eligible Faculty Committee Chair
  - Recommendation of Dept. Chair
  - 5 external letters of evaluation
  - Teaching Evaluations
  - Annual Reviews
- d) Clinical or Research Faculty Promotion (\*attach **one** Form [110](#) per department):
  - Complete with all OAA (i.e. [105](#), [106](#), [109](#), [114](#))
  - Vote of the eligible faculty and letter from Eligible Faculty Committee Chair
  - Recommendation of Dept. Chair
  - 5 external letters of evaluation
  - Teaching Evaluations
  - Annual Reviews

### B. Promotion & Tenure Process Levels

Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure is reviewed at three levels: by the department, the College, and the University that include:

#### Level 1

The initial level of review is by the department's eligible faculty (see Section III.A).

The vote of the eligible faculty is forwarded to the department chair who makes an independent evaluation of the candidate. When the departmental evaluation concludes, (i.e. when the department chair's recommendation is reached), the faculty member must be advised of this and that they have 10 days to provide comments about the decision. The comments process can address procedural errors or improper review but cannot be based on a simple disagreement with the decision. The department chair has the opportunity to respond to comments that are submitted by the faculty member. There is only one round of comments and response. Any comments and/or response become part of the dossier and included in subsequent phases of review.

Assuming that there is a positive evaluation by the peer-review group, the advocacy phase of the promotion process begins, whereby the department chair presents an objective review of the candidate's record of achievement to the College of Medicine's Promotion and Tenure Committee.

## **Level 2**

The College of Medicine Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews in a timely manner all nominations for promotion, and tenure in the College and make appropriate recommendations to the Dean. As a minimum, the review will consider: 1. Adherence to University, College, and Department guidelines. [Note specifically Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#), Department Patterns of Administration, regarding faculty input in department A, P&T decisions]. 2. The need for confidentiality, but not at the expense of the right of candidate to be kept informed of the progress of their nomination through College and University bureaucracy.

## **Level 3**

The University's Office of Academic Affairs screens each dossier that is submitted. Positive cases that pass screening do not go to the university-level committee; they are referred directly to the Board of Trustees for final approval. Dossiers that do not pass screening or came to the university-level with a negative recommendation at any level along the way, are forwarded to the university-level committee.

Positive decisions at the university-level are then forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final approval and implementation. All promotions become effective when the Board approves at their June meeting.

## **C. Promotion and Tenure Key Dates and Deadlines**

- **May:** College Dean notifies Department Chairs of their faculty's mandatory reviews for tenure, reappointment, fourth and eighth-year tenure track reviews
- **May 1 – June 30:** Departments notify the college which non-mandatory candidates requested promotion and/or tenure considerations
- **June 1 - Aug. 30:** Departments solicit external evaluations and candidates work on dossiers
- **Sept. 30:** Deadline for candidates to submit dossiers to Department Promotion & Tenure Committee
- **Nov. 1:** Deadline for departments to submit completed dossiers to College Office of Academic Affairs. Incomplete dossiers will be returned.
- **November - February:** College Promotion & Tenure Committee meetings occur
- **February:** Dean notifies candidates of College decision
- **3rd Friday in February:** Final deadline for departmental submission of Clinical and Research Faculty Re-appointments, and Tenure Track fourth and eighth-year reviews
- **4th Friday in February:** College submits dossiers to Provost
- **February - April:** University Promotion & Tenure Committee meetings occur
- **April:** fourth & eighth-year reviews returned to the department
- **April - May:** Provost notifies College / University of decision and submits recommendation to the Board of Trustees
- **June:** Board of Trustees final approval, title effective date
- **Sept. 1:** Salary increase implemented

#### D. Promotion and Tenure Timeline

General Promotion and Tenure Timeline	
Date	Description
January 1	Request for self-nomination for promotion sent to all assistant professor and associate professors
March 1	Due date for receipt of letter requesting self-nomination for promotion and updated CV in required format
March 15	P&T Committee reviews candidate CV; recommends moving forward or deferring for one or more years
March 31	Candidate notified of P&T Committee decision
April 1 – June 15	Candidates hired before 7/1/2018 complete core dossier in Word. Candidates hire on/after 7/1/2018 complete core dossier in VITA
April 1 – May 15	P&T Committee creates list of potential external evaluators (with input from P&T chair and Dept. Chair) and reviews it with candidate. Candidate may provide up to 3 additional names and request removal of

	no more than 2 names by providing reason for request. Dept. Chair determines whether removal request is justified.
May 15	Candidate submits core dossier to P&T Chair for review
June 1	Candidate provides peer and student teaching evaluations to P&T Chair for review
June 1	Requests for external evaluation are sent
June 15	Candidate completes core dossier and submits final version to P&T Committee for review
July 1	P&T Committee completes review of dossier for clarity, accuracy, placement of data and provides feedback to candidate
July 31	Candidate updates core dossier and submits it to P&T Chair
August 1	External review letters receipt deadline
September 1	Complete dossier submitted to Committee of Eligible Faculty for review
September 30	Committee of Eligible Faculty completes review and vote; candidate is notified by P&T Chair of outcome; candidate is provided 1 week to comment on decision
Early October	P&T Chair write letter summarizing comments from Committee of the Eligible Faculty, including votes and letter is placed in dossier
Mid October	Dept. Chair writes independent letter of assessment and letter is placed in dossier
November 1	Completed dossier is due to College of Medicine
November - February	COM P&T Committee meetings are held to review dossiers; candidate notified of outcome; dossiers are forwarded to Provost (OAA)
February - April	University P&T Committee meetings occur
April - May	Provost notifies COM of University decision; submits recommendation to Board of Trustees
May - June	Board of Trustees final approval, title change effective date
September 1	COM salary increase implemented