

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Biomedical Informatics (BMI)

Approved by the BMI Faculty: 04/02/2024

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 12/26/2024

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 12/1/2025

Table of Contents

I	Preamble	4
II	BMI Mission	4
III	BMI Values	5
IV	Definitions	6
	A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
	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 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (AP&T) Committee	9
	C Quorum	9
	D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	10
	1 Appointment.....	10
	2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	10
V	Appointments	10
	A Appointment Criteria	11
	1 Tenure-track Faculty	11
	2 Clinical Faculty	14
	3 Research Faculty	16
	4 Associated Faculty	17
	5 Emeritus Faculty	19
	6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	19
	7 Joint Appointments	20
	B Appointment Procedures	20
	1 Tenure-track Faculty	21
	2 Clinical Faculty	22
	3 Research Faculty	23
	4 Transfers: Track & TIU	23
	5 Associated Faculty	24
	6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	25
	7 Joint Appointment	25
VI	Annual Performance and Merit Review	25
	A Documentation	26
	B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	27
	1 Fourth-Year Review	27
	2 Extension of the Tenure Clock	28
	C Annual Review Procedures: Tenured Faculty	28
	D Annual Review and Reappointment Procedures: Clinical Faculty	28
	E Annual Review and Reappointment Procedures: Research Faculty	29
	F Annual Review Procedures: Associated Faculty	30
	G Salary Recommendations	30
VII	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	31
	A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	31

1	Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty	31
2	Promotion of Clinical Faculty	35
3	Promotion of Research Faculty	45
5	Associated Faculty	47
B	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Review: Procedures for Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty	47
1	Candidate Responsibilities	47
2	Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	53
3	Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities	54
4	Department Chair Responsibilities	55
5	Promotion Review: Procedures for Associated Faculty	56
6	External Evaluations	56
VIII	Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	58
IX	Reviews in the Final Year of Probation	59
X	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	58
A	Student Evaluation of Teaching	58
B	Peer Evaluation of Teaching	60
XI	Appendices	62
A	Glossary of Terms	62
B	AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics	64
C	BMI Criteria and Types of Evidence for Promotion and Tenure	65

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. 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 the Department of Biomedical Informatics (BMI) 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. 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 can be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and 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 the department's mission and criteria.

Decisions considering all appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the University's [policy on equal employment opportunity](#): "Ohio State does not discriminate on the basis of age, ancestry, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity or expression, genetic information, HIV/AIDS status, military status, national origin, pregnancy, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, or any other bases under the law, in its employment, which includes hiring and selection practices."

II. BMI Mission

The mission of the Department of Biomedical Informatics is to improve people's lives through innovation in research, education, and patient care. The vision of the Department of Biomedical Informatics is to lead the advancement of health and biomedicine through the development, application, and dissemination of novel biomedical informatics theories and methods capable of driving biological discovery, generating knowledge, and advancing personalized and population healthcare.

Biomedical informatics is a transdisciplinary field focused on turning data into knowledge that can advance our understanding of biology, biotechnology, clinical care, and health systems. The Department of Biomedical Informatics is committed to working as a team to

shape the future of medicine by creating, disseminating, and applying new knowledge and personalizing health care to meet the needs and preferences of each individual.

We share and endorse the values of the College of Medicine, including inclusiveness, determination, empathy, sincerity, ownership, and innovation. We operate on the premise that all faculty, staff, and students in the College have unique talents that contribute to the pursuit of excellence. In addition to professional accomplishments, collegiality, civility, and mutual respect are strongly held values. We support that people can have varied beliefs and encourage the free exchange of ideas and opinions, and expect that faculty, staff, and students promote these values and apply them in a professional manner in all academic endeavors and in both our internal and external interactions.

All members of our department contribute to our productivity, both through their personal accomplishments and by positively influencing the productivity of others. This synergism may be seen in the creation of our learning environment, research collaborations, co-authorship of publications, activities promoting health and wellness, and by sharing innovative ideas with the broader community. All members of our department should work toward establishing and maintaining a team culture and an enriching and varied intellectual working and learning environment. We are committed to evaluating the practice of these core values as part of all performance evaluations.

III. BMI Values

The values of the Department of Biomedical Informatics are as follows:

- Our eminence is, first and foremost, the strength of our faculty, staff, and trainees.
- We value integrity and respect in our continuous assessment and optimization of department-wide strategies and resource allocation, ensuring accountability and responsible actions in pursuing our vision and mission.
- The principles of openness, transparency, efficiency, individual responsibility, and shared governance are critical to the creation of a collaborative and high-performance workplace.
- We will constantly strive to achieve balance and excellence in all aspects of our tripartite mission, placing particular emphasis on our role as researchers, educators, and practitioners working to create the future of personalized healthcare.
- We value the relevance of our work to the broad community and strive to disseminate the knowledge generated by our scholarly activities to the Clinical and translational science, life science, bioinformatics, clinical informatics, computational science, biostatistics, implementation science, and learning health system communities, as it is central to our departmental mission and vision.

IV. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointments (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have BMI as their tenure-initiating unit. BMI does not require a formal vote of the faculty for new instructor or assistant professor appointments as defined in this Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document.

The BMI chair, the dean and assistant/associate/vice 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.

Senior rank faculty under consideration, regardless of category (tenure-track, clinical, research, associated), may be reviewed only by faculty of the rank at or above consideration (associate and professor for appointment/promotion to associate professor, professor for appointment/promotion to professor).

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- Initial appointment reviews in BMI. The recommendation to the BMI chair is the responsibility of the search committee.
- Advanced 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.

Promotion or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the 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

- **Initial appointment reviews in BMI.** The recommendation to the BMI chair is the responsibility of the search committee.

- **Advanced 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 non-probationary 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 non-probationary associate clinical professors, and all non-probationary 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 non-probationary clinical professors.

3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Initial appointment reviews in BMI.** The recommendation to the BMI chair is the responsibility of the search committee.
- **Advanced 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 non-probationary 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 non-probationary 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 non-probationary research professors.

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointments & Reappointments:

For initial associated faculty appointments, the search committee makes recommendations to the BMI chair. Senior rank appointments require a faculty vote and approval from the college dean.

Reappointments are reviewed by eligible faculty, consisting of all tenured faculty at or above the candidate's rank, as well as non-probationary clinical and research faculty of equal or higher rank.

Promotion Reviews

Associated faculty with adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles are eligible for promotion but not tenure.

- **Adjunct Faculty:** Promotion reviews for adjunct faculty follow the same criteria as tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, depending on the nature of the appointment.
- **Appointment at tenure-track titles with 49% FTE or below:** Promotion of associated faculty with tenure-track titles follows the same criteria as for full-time tenure-track faculty.
- **Lecturers:** Promotion to Senior Lecturer is decided by the BMI chair in consultation with the AP&T Committee.

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 they are or have been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on more than 50% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations; d) 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 e) 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.

In addition, an individual who has had personal or professional conflicts with the candidate is ineligible to participate in the discussion and vote. It is the responsibility of the BMI chair 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.

6. Minimum Composition

In the event that BMI does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department chair, after consulting with the Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs, will appoint a faculty member (or multiple faculty members) from another tenure-initiating unit within the College when establishing the committee.

B. Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (AP&T) Committee

The Department has an Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (AP&T) Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing faculty evaluation and promotion and tenure issues. The committee comprises five faculty members, including the Committee Chair. At a minimum, the AP&T committee should consist of three tenured faculty members and at least one non-probationary clinical faculty member. The Department's Vice Chair of Faculty Affairs serves as the committee's Chair and is appointed by the Department Chair for a three-year term, with reappointment possible. The remaining four committee members are appointed by the Vice Chair of Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Department Chair, and serve one to three-year terms, with reappointment possible. Committee members serve at the discretion of the Department Chair and can be removed at any time. Appointments to the committee are finalized by the early spring semester of each year.

C. Quorum

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

Faculty members on approved university leave (e.g., medical, business, parental) are not counted when determining 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 dean has approved an off-campus assignment.

Faculty members with a competing scheduling constraint at the scheduled meeting time do not have excused absences and do count as members of the eligible faculty.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, particularly promotion and tenure reviews, only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not permitted. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to participate fully in the review process and make informed decisions in these votes.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via a remote two-way electronic connection is allowed.

1. Appointment

In the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment, search committees make their recommendations to the BMI department chair. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

- In the case of a joint appointment, BMI must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment BMI prior to their appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

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

V. Appointments

BMI is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of BMI. Important considerations include the individual’s record to date in teaching, scholarship, and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; evidence of activities that foster university, college, and BMI values, including inclusivity; 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 BMI. Offers will only be extended to individuals who engage in behavior consistent with college and BMI values, as assessed through the faculty disciplinary background check performed by the Office of Academic Affairs. 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 BMI. The search is either canceled 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.

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.

A. Appointment Criteria

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The tenure-track exists for those faculty members who primarily strive to achieve sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship and successful competition for extramural funding. Although excellence in teaching and outstanding service to The Ohio State University is required, these alone are not sufficient for progress on this track. Appointments to this track are made in accordance with University Rule [3335-6-02](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of BMI. All faculty members have access to all pertinent documents detailing BMI, College of Medicine, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. The most updated documents are located at the University Office of Academic Affairs [website](#).

Appointment: Instructor. An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary. During the probationary period, a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Appointments to this rank may be made if all of the criteria for the position of assistant professor have been met, with the exception that the candidate will not have completed a terminal degree or other relevant training at the time of the appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. When an individual is appointed to the rank of instructor, the letter of offer should indicate the specific benchmarks and achievements required for promotion to 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 of appointment, or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor has not met the expectations for moving from instructor to the rank of assistant professor by the

beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. Unless there are unique circumstances, the college recommends against requesting prior service credit. This request must be approved by BMI's eligible faculty, the Department chair, the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs and, if approved, cannot be revoked except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Criteria for appointment to the rank of instructor include the following:

Anticipated receipt of an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Individuals who have completed all the requirements of their terminal degree but who have not obtained the final degree at the time of initial employment will be appointed as instructors.

Evidence of potential for excellence in scholarship. Such evidence might include peer-reviewed publications in a mentored setting but insufficient evidence of an independent, creative, and productive program of research with potential for external funding.

No ongoing negative behaviors such as discrimination, bullying, harassment, retaliation, or promotion of other hostile work conditions, as assessed through the faculty disciplinary background check performed by the Office of Academic Affairs.

A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional, ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].

In aggregate, accomplishments related to the above criteria should be sufficiently compelling that the appointee is judged to have significant potential to attain tenure and a distinguished record as a faculty member in BMI.

Appointment: Assistant Professor. An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary. During a probationary period, a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Tenure cannot be awarded at the rank of assistant professor. An assistant professor must be reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the mandatory review year (6th year of appointment); however, promotion and tenure may be granted by following the promotion and tenure review process at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement so merits. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time, subject to the provisions of University Rule [3335-6-08](#) and the provisions of paragraphs (6), (H), and (I) of University Rule [3335-6-03](#).

Consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-6-09](#), faculty members are reviewed for promotion & tenure no later than the 6th year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the 7th year. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment.

For appointments at the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit of up to three years may be granted for work experience at the time of the initial appointment. Doing so requires the approval of the eligible faculty and Department chair, Dean, Executive Vice President, and Provost. Prior service credit shortens a probationary period by the amount of the credit. The College discourages these requests because, if granted, it cannot be revoked except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Criteria for an appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor in the Tenure Track include:

An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.

Early evidence of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by the initial development of a body of research, scholarship, and creative work. In addition, evidence must be provided that supports a candidate's potential for an independent program of scholarship and a strong likelihood of independent extramural research funding.

No ongoing negative behavior such as discrimination, bullying, harassment, retaliation, or promotion of other hostile work conditions, as assessed through the faculty disciplinary background check performed by the Office of Academic Affairs .

A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional, ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].

In aggregate, accomplishments related to the above criteria should be sufficiently compelling that the appointee is judged to have significant potential to attain tenure and a distinguished record as a faculty member in the College of Medicine.

Appointment: Associate Professor with Tenure. The appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with tenure, require prior approval of the Dean of the College of Medicine and the Office of Academic Affairs. Criteria for appointment to the rank of associate professor with tenure are identical to the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, as detailed in Section VII of this document. In general, appointments at higher ranks shall not entail a probationary period unless there are compelling reasons not to offer tenure.

Appointment: Professor with Tenure. The appointment offers at the rank of professor

require prior approval of the Dean of the College of Medicine and the Office of Academic Affairs. Criteria for initial appointment to the rank of professor with tenure are identical to BMI's and College of Medicine's criteria for promotion to professor with tenure, as detailed in Section VII of this document. Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not permitted. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2. Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are equivalent in importance to BMI as the Tenure Track faculty. The Clinical faculty exists in BMI for those faculty members whose principal career focus is outstanding teaching, clinical and translational research, and delivery of exemplary 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 that in the Tenure Track and may be focused on a mixture of academic pursuits, including the scholarship of applied methods in study design and data analysis, informatics platform development and implementation, practice, integration, community engagement, and education, as well as new knowledge discovery. Faculty members appointed to the clinical faculty may choose to distinguish themselves in teaching, innovative educational program development, or team science research. Faculty members appointed to the clinical faculty may choose to distinguish themselves through several portfolios of responsibility, including Clinician-Educator or Clinician-Scholar. The Clinician-Educator pathway may reflect excellence as an educator, as measured by teaching evaluations and innovative teaching practices and curricula, or module development and publications. The Clinician-Scholar pathway reflects excellence in basic science, biostatistics and biomedical informatics research, translational science, clinical research and/or health services research (e.g., secondary data analyses, clinical trial study design, biostatistics and bioinformatics data analysis, applied methodology to solve problems that arise in their collaborative studies, clinical informatics tool development and implementation, public health care policy, outcomes, and comparative effectiveness research) as measured by publications and grant funding, respectively. Faculty members on the Clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters of tenure-track faculty.

All appointments of faculty members to the Clinical faculty are made in accordance with Chapter 7 of the *Rules for University Faculty* [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of BMI. All faculty members have access to all pertinent documents detailing Departmental BMI, College of Medicine, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. The most updated documents can be located on the Office of Academic Affairs [website](#). In accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7-03](#), clinical faculty in BMI may comprise no more than 40% of the total tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty.

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 at all ranks is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year if they will be reappointed for another 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. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of the contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical faculty must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years.

Appointment: Assistant Professor in the Clinical faculty. Candidates for appointment at this rank are expected to have completed all relevant training, including graduate studies, consistent with the existing or proposed educational program goals of BMI. The initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary. During a probationary period, a faculty member is considered for reappointment annually. A probationary appointment may be terminated at any time, subject to the provisions of University Rule [3335-6-08](#) and the provisions of paragraphs (B) and (D) of University Rule [3335-7-07](#). An assistant professor may be reviewed for promotion at any time during the probationary period or during a subsequent contract.

This is the appropriate level for the initial appointment of persons holding the appropriate terminal degree and relevant experience/expertise. Candidates for appointment to the rank of assistant professor on the clinical faculty will have at a minimum:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.
- Evidence of contributions to scholarship and education and the potential to advance through the faculty ranks.
- A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional, ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].
- No ongoing negative behaviors such as discrimination, bullying, harassment, retaliation, or promotion of other hostile work conditions, as assessed through the faculty disciplinary background check performed by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment: Associate Professor in the Clinical faculty. The criteria for initial appointment at the rank of associate professor to the clinical faculty are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VII of this document. Appointments at the associate clinical professor rank require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

Appointment: Professor in the Clinical faculty. The criteria for initial appointment at the rank of professor in the clinical faculty are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VII of this document. Appointments at the clinical

professor rank require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

3. Research Faculty

Research faculty appointments exist for individuals who focus entirely on research. These appointments are intended for individuals who will have faculty-level responsibilities in the research mission comparable to the level of a Co-Investigator. Individuals who serve as laboratory managers or otherwise contribute to the research mission at a level comparable to that of a postdoctoral fellow should not be appointed to the research faculty but rather should be appointed as research scientists, potentially with associated faculty appointments (postdoctoral fellows are appointed as postdoctoral researchers). Appointments to the Research faculty are made in accordance with Chapter 7 of the *Rules of the University Faculty* [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of BMI. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the Tenure Track faculty in a BMI, Research faculty must comprise no more than twenty percent of the number of Tenure Track faculty in BMI. In all cases, however, the number of Research faculty positions in a unit must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in BMI.

Tenure is not granted to research faculty. Contracts will be for a period of at least one year and for no more than five years, and must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, research faculty appointments will require 95% salary recovery. It is expected that salary recovery will be entirely derived from research funds. The initial contract 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. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

Research faculty members are eligible to serve on University committees and task forces, but not on University governance committees. Research faculty members are also eligible to advise and supervise graduate and postdoctoral students and to be principal investigators on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the Graduate School, as detailed in Section 13 of the [Graduate School Handbook](#).

Appointment: Assistant Professor on the Research faculty. The candidate for appointment as a research assistant professor must have, at a minimum:

An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.

Completion of sufficient research training to provide the basis for specific expertise

for contributing to the research mission.

An initial record of scholarship that indicates effective collaboration and contribution to peer-reviewed research, reflected by co-authorship of peer-reviewed publications or funded effort on peer-reviewed grants.

No ongoing negative behavior such as discrimination, bullying, harassment, retaliation, or promotion of other hostile work conditions, as assessed through the faculty disciplinary background check performed by the Office of Academic Affairs.

A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional, ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].

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

Appointment: Associate Professor on the Research faculty. The criteria for initial appointment to the rank of associate professor on the research faculty are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VII of this document. Appointments at the research associate professor rank require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

Appointment: Professor on the Research faculty. The criteria for initial appointment to the rank of professor on the research faculty are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VII of this document. Appointments at the research professor rank require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

4. Associated Faculty

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

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct faculty appointments, which may be compensated or uncompensated, are granted to individuals who provide academic service to the department, such as teaching courses or serving on graduate student committees. Appointments are made at the ranks of Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, or Adjunct Professor, with the rank determined by applying the criteria for tenure-track, teaching/professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate. These appointments typically last up to three years, ending on June 30 of the fiscal year, and require an intake form and a curriculum vitae on file. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion, though not tenure, using the same criteria for promotion as other faculty categories. Examples of service include teaching and participating in graduate student committees.

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.

Lecturer. Appointment as a 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 the ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

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

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. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

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

- Have significant and meaningful interaction in at least one of the following mission areas of the College of Medicine:
- Must teach students in biomedical informatics training programs and/or medical students, residents, clinical fellows, undergraduate, and graduate students.
- Candidates are expected to actively engage in collaborative research projects with the Department of Biomedical Informatics.
- Provide service to the Department of Biomedical Informatics: This includes participation in committees.
- Show no ongoing negative behavior such as discrimination, bullying, harassment, retaliation, or promotion of other hostile work conditions, as assessed through the faculty disciplinary background check performed by the

- Office of Academic Affairs.
- Have a mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].

Associated Faculty at Advanced Rank. Associated faculty may be compensated or uncompensated and typically provide service to BMI in the areas of research or education. For compensated faculty who contribute principally through educational activities or scholarship, the appointment at advanced rank criteria and procedures will be identical to those for the clinician-educator pathway or scholar pathway.

5. 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.

The faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to BMI Chair, outlining academic performance and citizenship. BMI chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate, submit it to the dean, who will forward a recommendation to the executive vice president and provost. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the ten 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.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

A non-salaried appointment for a University faculty member from another department is considered a Courtesy appointment. An individual with an appointment in one department may request a Courtesy appointment in another department when that faculty member's scholarly and academic activity overlaps significantly with the discipline represented by the second unit. Such appointments must be made in the same faculty rank/track, using the same title as that offered in the primary department. Courtesy appointments are warranted only if they are accompanied by substantial involvement in the academic and scholarly work of the department.

7. Joint Appointments

Joint faculty appointments between a faculty member's TIU and another academic unit or units are created for the mutual benefit of the faculty member's expertise that advances the scholarship, teaching, or clinical mission of all the academic units involved and promotes cross-disciplinary collaboration. These are paid faculty positions with the FTE and salary support shared between one or more academic units. These appointments are therefore distinct from courtesy appointments. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) is created by the academic units creating the joint appointment and will clearly define distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units, the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units on manuscripts, the manner in which credit for grant funding will be attributed to the different units and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units.

B. Appointment 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 from the search.

In addition, 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 a senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring tenure-track faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer.

BMI's AP&T processes follow the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. Any faculty appointment forwarded from BMI for approval by the College of Medicine must have been made consistent with SHIFT processes, and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College of Medicine, (2) the *Rules of the University Faculty*, (3) the University Office of Academic Affairs, including the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and (4) the Office of Human Resources. A draft letter of offer to a faculty candidate must be reviewed and approved by the Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs of the College of Medicine. The draft letter of offer will be reviewed for consistency with the essential components required by the University Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and by the

College. Letters of offer are managed through the approved online contract management system. The following sections provide general guidelines for searches in the different faculty categories.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a broad 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 Office of Academic Affairs in advance. The search must include faculty input sufficient to reflect the perspective of all those who will collaborate and share the work environment with the candidate and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The dean or designee of the college provides approval for BMI to commence a search. The BMI Chair or the individual who has commissioned the search, appoints a search committee, generally consisting of three or more faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search, as well as synergistic fields within BMI.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the training 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 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 applicant pools, conduct consistent 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 BMI, creating a search strategy (including a 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 talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit 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 and fairness 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 BMI 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 the offer involves a senior rank (associate professor or above), solicitation of external letters of evaluation is required and will follow the same guidelines as for promotion reviews. The eligible faculty members must also vote on the appointment. If the offer letter provides for prior service credit towards the award of tenure, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the University Office of Academic Affairs.

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

BMI chair will discuss the potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or non-immigrant 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

Searches for initial appointments for clinical faculty should follow the same procedures as those utilized by BMI and the College of Medicine for tenure-track

faculty, with the exception that the candidate is not required to give a presentation during the interview. A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all clinical faculty positions. Exceptions to this policy must be requested in advance from the Office of Academic Affairs. In the case of approval of a waiver for a search (when considering a partner hire through the dual-career program or moving a staff member with faculty duties to a clinical faculty position, for example), BMI must complete a full review, the Department Chair must provide a recommendation, and the dean must approve the hire. As above, faculty appointed to the clinical faculty should evidence a career consistent with the values of BMI (see Section II) and the College of Medicine, and aligned with their cultures.

3. Research Faculty

Searches for initial appointments in the research faculty should follow the same procedures as those utilized by BMI and the College of Medicine for tenure-track faculty. As for candidates for appointment to the tenure-track faculty, it is recommended that research faculty candidates make a presentation to learners and faculty regarding their scholarship. A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all research faculty positions. Exceptions to this policy must be requested in advance from the Office of Academic Affairs. As above, faculty appointed to this appointment type should evidence a career consistent with the values of BMI (see Section II) and the College of Medicine and aligned with their cultures.

4. Transfers: Track & TIU

Transfers between faculty categories are permitted only under the strict guidelines detailed in the paragraphs below, per University Rules [3335-7-09](#) and [3335-7-10](#). A transfer to a different appointment type should be motivated by a clear change in a faculty member's career orientation and goals. An engaged, committed, productive faculty should be the ultimate goal of all appointments.

Transfer: Tenure-Track to Clinical Faculty

If a faculty member's activities become more aligned with the criteria for appointment to the clinical faculty, they may request a transfer. A transfer request must be approved by the BMI chair, dean, executive vice president, and provost. The first appointment to the clinical faculty is probationary, and tenure, or the possibility thereof, is revoked.

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.

The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities.

Transfer: Tenure-Track to Research Faculty

If faculty members wish to engage exclusively in research, without the multiple demands required of the tenure-track, they may request a transfer. A transfer request must be approved by the BMI chair, dean, executive vice president, and provost. The first appointment to the research faculty is probationary; and tenure, or the possibility thereof, is revoked.

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.

The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities.

Transfer: Clinical or Research to Tenure-Track

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

The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities.

Transfer: Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU Transfer)

Following consultation with TIU chairs and college dean(s), a faculty member may voluntarily move from one TIU to another upon approval of a simple majority of eligible faculty in the receiving TIU (e.g., if an associate clinical professor is transferring, the eligible faculty are all tenured associate professors and professors and all non-probationary associate clinical professors and clinical professors).

Approval of the transfer by the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements between the administrators of the affected TIUs, including the TIU chairs, 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. Administrative 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.

5. Associated Faculty

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) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the

BMI chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the BMI chair following a vote of the eligible faculty, according to this document.

Appointments to an unpaid associated faculty position require no formal search process.

Associated 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 BMI'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.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any BMI 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 BMI, 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.

7. Joint Appointment

BMI may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section V.7, which details the process by which these appointments are granted.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements between the administrators of the affected TIUs, including the TIU chairs, 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 for the change have been made.

VI. Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures

The annual performance and merit review of a faculty member is the responsibility of the BMI chair. This must be a thorough review that accurately reflects the faculty member's performance in the previous year.

- 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 must include the College of Medicine's expectation for collegiality. Faculty are expected to set a high example of collegiality in the workplace with respect for personal boundaries.
- The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU chair 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.

BMI must follow the requirements for annual performance and merit reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#). It is the expectation of the college that annual performance and merit reviews will also be consistent with a BMI's APT document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by (1) the college, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the University Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

The dean must assess an annual performance and merit review when BMI has submitted (1) a Report of Non-Renewal of Probationary Appointment of Faculty; (2) the fourth-year review of a probationary faculty member; or (3) a Report of Contract Renewal or Non-Renewal for clinical faculty or research faculty. In each of these cases, the decision of the dean is final.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department chair by the date requested:

- 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 VII 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

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss 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 recommends the 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 they choose).

If the Department chair 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 the renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth-Year Review

Each tenure-track faculty member in the fourth year of probationary service must undergo a review using the same process as the review for promotion and tenure, with two exceptions: external letters of evaluation will not be required, and the dean (not BMI chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. In addition, review by the College of Medicine Promotion and Tenure Committee is not mandatory when both BMI and the dean approve the renewal of the appointment. The objective of this review will be to determine if adequate progress toward the achievement of promotion and tenure is being made by the candidate.

External evaluations are solicited only when either the BMI chair or the unit's eligible faculty determines they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty does not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

In all cases, the dean or their designee independently evaluates all faculty in their fourth year of probationary appointment and will provide the BMI chair 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 (see below). [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. Annual Review Procedures: Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the Department chair, who conducts an independent assessment, meets with the faculty member to discuss 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, who meets with the faculty member to discuss 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 tenure initiating unit, 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 BMI, 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 prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

D. Annual Review and Reappointment Procedures: Clinical Faculty

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 contract year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, the Department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. 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.

For probationary faculty, if the position continues, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a reappointment. This review involves the solicitation of an updated CV and a vote by all eligible faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

For non-probationary faculty in their second or subsequent term, the individual must be informed whether the appointment will be extended by the end of the penultimate year of each appointment period. If the Department Chair decides not to renew, that decision must be reviewed by the eligible faculty. If the Department Chair decides to renew, that decision will be final. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Annual Review and Reappointment Procedures: Research Faculty

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

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the Department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. A formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. The reappointment review during the probationary period (i.e., initial term) requires either a dossier or a complete CV which is reviewed by the committee of eligible faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

For non-probationary faculty in their second or subsequent term, the individual must be informed whether the appointment will be extended by the penultimate year of each appointment period. If the Department Chair decides to renew, that decision will be final. If the Department Chair decides not to renew, that decision must be reviewed by the eligible faculty. This review requires either a dossier or complete CV, which is reviewed by the committee of eligible faculty. External letters are not solicited. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

Reappointments will only be made for the length of time faculty can demonstrate salary support. If it does 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 appointment.

F. Annual Review Procedures: Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members, whether in their initial appointment or on a multi-year contract, are subject to a review process conducted by the Department Chair or a designated representative. This process includes the preparation of a written evaluation and a meeting to discuss the faculty member's performance, future objectives, and aspirations. For those in their initial appointment, this review is a prerequisite for considering reappointment, with the Department Chair holding final authority on renewal decisions and the potential offer of a multi-year contract. Faculty members already on multi-year contracts undergo an annual review, where the Department Chair's decision on reappointment is final. When considering the reappointment of non-compensated associated faculty members, at a minimum, their contribution to BMI must be assessed on an annual basis and documented for the individual's personnel file. This may take the form of self-evaluation. Neither a formal written review nor a meeting is required.

G. Salary Recommendations

The Department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the Dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review, as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months.

In formulating recommendations, the Department chair consults with the BMI Executive Committee. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market issues. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual 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 on 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.

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 by BMI.

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 24 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance and a pattern of consistent professional growth will be viewed positively. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more core areas as defined by the Department Chair are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty members who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section VI-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.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion review. Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. It is recognized that 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 University and College of Medicine initiatives. Examples include participation in faculty governance, outreach, and service, ethical behavior, adherence to principles of responsible conduct of research, constructive conduct and behavior during the discharge of duties, responsibilities, and authority, and the exercise of rights and privileges of a member of the faculty as reflected in the “[Statement on Professional Ethics](#)” of the American Association of University Professors.

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

1. Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty

a. 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 is an acknowledgment of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It requires evidence of consistent achievement throughout the professional life of the faculty member. Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure occurs when a faculty member exhibits convincing evidence of excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated by a national level of impact and recognition of scholarship. In addition, excellence in teaching and service is required, but it alone is

not sufficient for promotion and tenure awards. These three key areas of achievement, scholarship, teaching, and service, are individually discussed 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](#) [Appendix B]. The criteria and types of evidence necessary for demonstrating impact, along with confirmation that these criteria have been satisfactorily met, are detailed in the charts below. Detailed promotion criteria appear in Appendix C.

BMI recognizes that evidence of excellence may vary by individual due to their assigned work. The evidence of excellence should thus be based upon an individual's assigned work and reflected in the candidate's self-assessment and statement of plans and goals. A summary of the candidate's teaching portfolio, including evidence of formative evaluation, is recommended as a helpful tool for reviewers. The candidate's responsibility is to build a dossier demonstrating that they meet the promotion and/or tenure criteria. The content below is not meant to be exhaustive, but is provided to demonstrate the types of criteria and evidence for each category that may support promotion.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

SCHOLARSHIP: PUBLICATIONS	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustained record of publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List 15-25 relevant peer-reviewed publications since the assistant professor's appointment. Continuous scholarly output documentation reflecting quality and quantity.
Quality and impact of publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of publications in top-tier journals with high impact factors and documentation of significant works. Metrics detailing total publications, citation counts, and publication trajectory. Non-traditional impact metrics, including social media reach, altmetrics scores, and non-academic presentations. Analysis of journal impact factors in the context of BMI field norms.
Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of substantial research contributions where the faculty member was pivotal. Intellectual contribution details within the dossier for significant publications.
Independence and originality in scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of original research and contributions that clearly distinguish the faculty member's work from that of mentors or collaborators. Publications where the faculty member is the primary investigator or author, demonstrating independent thought and research direction.
Impact of scholarship on the field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concrete examples of how the scholarship has influenced the field, including adopting methods, peer citation, or implementing findings in practice. Testimonials or third-party evaluations attest to the significance and impact of the scholarship.
Contribution to the body of knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A list of contributions that significantly advanced the field, including peer-reviewed publications, book chapters, edited volumes, or other scholarly outputs. Documentation of how the broader academic community and industry have received and utilized these contributions, if applicable.

SCHOLARSHIP: PUBLICATIONS	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Research Leadership and Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Records showing first, senior, or corresponding authorship in key publications. For independent research, evidence of substantial authorship in significant publications.
Collaborative, multidisciplinary research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative research documentation highlighting indispensable contributions. Documentation of the faculty's role in multi-authored works, especially for middle authorship.
Strong BMI expertise through publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of peer-reviewed research articles or proceedings showcasing field expertise. Review articles were included to indicate field expertise, with a cap of less than 30% of the total publication list.
Broad scholarly activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of scholarly activities, clearly documenting the faculty member's contributions. Evidence of how these activities have contributed to the advancement of the field, showcasing the faculty's versatility and ability to innovate within various scholarly roles

SCHOLARSHIP: EXTERNAL GRANTS	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustained or multiple external peer-reviewed grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of grants awarded with details such as funding agency, title, amount, and duration. Evidence of renewals or additional grants demonstrating sustainability and recognition in the field. Grants received from various sources, including NIH, NSF, DoD, USDA, AHRQ, DARPA, RWJF, Commonwealth Fund, or Kaiser Family Foundation, or industry/private sector sponsors.
Leadership and independence in grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of roles as PI or MPI on significant grants (e.g., R01, P01, U54, K award, or equivalent industry/private sector awards). Evidence of leadership in multidisciplinary, externally supported studies.
Leadership in team science grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roles as a primary leader (e.g., Core Director) in large team-based research projects. Documents demonstrating leadership and independence within team science settings, including industry-sponsored collaborations.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Evidence of entrepreneurial activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patents, licenses, and invention disclosures with details on relevance and impact. Formation of startup companies and involvement in technology commercialization.
Contribution to scholarship through entrepreneurship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of invention disclosures, copyrights, and patents equates to scholarly outputs like meeting abstracts or peer-reviewed manuscripts. Revenue-generating licensing activities are considered equivalent to extramural grant awards.
Impact of entrepreneurship on the field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metrics include citations for related publications, downloads, and developed software or tools. Indicators of software impact, including dependencies in other packages and platform recognition (e.g., GitHub stars).

TEACHING and MENTORING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of serving as a course director or developing new courses, including course materials and curricula. Summary of other teaching and mentoring roles with evidence and documents. Documentation of mentoring activities and their outcomes.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Evaluations from students, residents, fellows, and peers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation of positive evaluations from students, residents, fellows, local colleagues, and national peers. • Feedback and testimonials highlighting teaching effectiveness.
Contribution and impact on teaching and training programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed accounts of the faculty members' contributions to teaching and training programs. • Examples of curricular innovation, new teaching modalities, and program development.
Recognition of teaching excellence through awards and honors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of teaching awards and honors received, indicating recognition of teaching excellence.
Impactful, innovative programs integrating teaching, research, and hands-on training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions of programs developed by the faculty members that integrate teaching, research, and practical experience. • Evidence of the program's impact on students and the institution.
Contributions to improving cultural competence and access to teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiatives or programs led by the faculty member to improve cultural competence or access to teaching for underserved populations. • Documentation of the impact of these efforts, such as enhanced cultural understanding among students.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Effective service at the departmental and collegiate levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Records of appointment or election to committees or working groups within BMI, College of Medicine, hospital, and University. Leadership roles in programs or initiatives at the departmental or collegiate level.
Administrative service to the university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document significant administrative roles and contributions to OSU, including task forces, committees, and program development efforts.
Contribution to professional service within the faculty member's discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of participation in ad hoc journal reviews, editorial boards, or editorships. Roles as grant reviewers for national funding agencies. Elected or appointed offices in professional societies, served on panels and commissions and contributed to local and national professional societies.
Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of professional consultations to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. Contributions to panels, advisory boards, and commissions that impact the broader community or field.
Development and leadership of innovative programs advancing the university's mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptions of innovative programs created to deliver healthcare to the community or addressing societal problems. Evidence of the sustainability and impact of these programs, including outcomes and recognitions.

c. Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor. The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and higher quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. A record of scholarly work in the rank of associate professor is not sufficient by simply reproducing a similar level of publications completed during the assistant professor appointments.

Awarding promotion to the rank of professor with tenure must be based upon convincing, unequivocal evidence that the candidate has a sustained eminence in their field with a record of achievement recognized by national leadership and/or international recognition and impact. The general criteria for promotion in scholarship, teaching, and service require more advanced and sustained quantity, quality, and impact than that required for promotion to associate professor. Importantly, the standard for external national/international reputation is substantially more rigorous than for promotion to Associate professor with tenure. This record of excellence must be evident from activities undertaken and accomplishments achieved since being appointed or promoted to the rank of associate professor. It is expected that the faculty member will have a consistent record of high-quality publications with demonstrated impact well beyond that required for promotion to associate professor.

Promotion to Professor (with Tenure)

SCHOLARSHIP: PUBLICATIONS	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustained and enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of 25-40 peer-reviewed publications or proceedings since promotion to Associate Professor, demonstrating an advanced scholarly output. Evidence of impactful work published in highly respected journals, potentially including Nature and Science.
National or international reputation for significant scholarly contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of citations, awards, and recognitions that reflect the national or international impact of the publications. Invitations to present at prestigious conferences or institutions as a testament to the scholar's reputation in the field.
Leadership and Independence in research and publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence showing the candidate as the first, senior, or corresponding author in high-impact publications and providing the number of these publications. Documentation of the candidate's critical and essential role in advancing the research field through these publications.
Impact of Scholarship Beyond the potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concrete examples of how the published work has influenced the field, including adopting methods, peer citation, or implementing findings in practice. Testimonials, reviews, or third-party evaluations highlighting the significance and impact of the scholarship.

SCHOLARSHIP: EXTERNAL GRANTS	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustained record of external funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of nationally competitive and current peer-reviewed extramural funding to support the research program, showing a continuous level of funding since promotion to Associate Professor. May include sustained support as PI or core-leader from multiple industry/private sector sponsors.
Leadership and independence in external grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of serving as PI or multiple-PD/PI on significant grants such as an NIH R01, supported by one of the following: a competitive renewal of the award, a second nationally competitive grant of equivalent scale, or simultaneous funding on two R01-level or equivalent grants, including significant industry or private sector funding of equivalent scale and impact. Leadership roles in large team-based research projects with documented impact, including primary leadership positions like Core Director.
Competitive renewals and breadth of funding sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of competitive renewals or simultaneous funding on multiple significant awards, demonstrating the sustainability and recognition of the research program. Records of funding from various sources, including NIH, NSF, DoD, USDA, AHRQ, DARPA, and prominent national charitable foundations, or industry/private sector sponsors, reflect the research program's breadth and recognition.
National or international recognition through funded research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of how the funded research has contributed to establishing a national or international reputation, including significant findings, innovations, or contributions to policy. Recognition from funding bodies, professional societies, or within the scholarly community that highlights the candidate's eminence and leadership in the field. Evidence of the candidate's role and contributions to team science efforts for externally funded grants, including those sponsored by private industry, and leadership in multi-institutional collaborations

TEACHING AND MENTORING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Continued strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching evaluations from students, residents, fellows, local colleagues, and national peers, showing consistently high performance. Documented outcomes of mentees, including successful career advancements, publications, and contributions to the field.
Development and leadership in new courses and programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of new course development, including course syllabi, content, and student feedback. Leadership roles in program development, such as training program directorships or creating innovative educational initiatives.
Innovation in teaching methodologies and modalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of innovative teaching practices, such as web-based design, mobile applications, virtual teaching, and new methods of evaluating teaching effectiveness. Examples of how these innovations have been adopted or recognized by others in the field.
Significant contributions to teaching and training programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of impactful contributions to curricular innovation, program or course development, and publications on teaching. Recognition of the faculty member's role in enhancing teaching and training programs, including teaching awards and honors.
Mentorship of junior faculty and impact on their professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented mentorship relationships with junior faculty, including mentees' achievements and testimonials about the mentorship's impact. Evidence of the faculty member's influence on junior colleagues' career paths, research opportunities, and professional growth.
Enhancement of cultural competence and accessibility in education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiatives or programs led by the faculty member to improve cultural competence or access to education for underserved populations. Documentation of the impact of these efforts on the educational environment, or enhanced cultural understanding among students and faculty.
National and international recognition for contributions to education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invitations to organize or contribute to national or international courses, workshops, and curricula. Election or appointment to leadership positions in educational committees or societies, reflecting recognition of the faculty member's contributions to the field of education. Awards and recognitions received from professional societies or institutions for excellence in teaching and mentoring, including recognition of outstanding mentoring of trainees, fellows, and junior faculty in T, F K, and similar awards.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Service to the academic and broader community at advanced levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership roles in committees or working groups within the College of Medicine, OSU, and beyond, indicating significant contributions to the academic community. Documentation of innovative programs or initiatives led by the faculty member that have advanced the university's mission or positively impacted the community.
National and international professional service and leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of election or appointment to leadership positions in national or international societies, reflecting recognition and influence in the field. Roles as chair of national committees, task forces, or review panels, showcasing leadership and contributions to the profession nationally or internationally.
Contribution to the advancement of professional standards and practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement in developing guidelines, standards, or policies that have influenced professional practices or education within the field. Participation in specialty boards or Residency Review Committees of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, contributing to advancing medical education and training standards.
Provision of professional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultative roles and professional services provided to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations, demonstrating the application of expertise to address broader societal challenges.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
expertise to public and private entities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of the impact of these consultative activities, including policy changes, program development, or enhancements in professional practices.
Leadership in service activities that improve cultural competence and accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiatives led by the faculty member to improve cultural competence within the BMI, College, University, or broader community. Evidence of these initiatives' successful implementation and impact, such as increased accessibility in educational or professional settings.
Recognition for service contributions at the national or international levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awards, honors, or other recognition for service contributions indicate esteem and appreciation from professional societies, communities, or institutions. Testimonials or third-party evaluations highlighting the significance and impact of the faculty member's service activities on the national or international stage.

2. Promotion of Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members are not eligible for tenure. The criteria in the categories of teaching and service are, for the most part, similar to those for the Tenure Track for each faculty rank, although there is a greater emphasis on teaching and service for clinical faculty and less emphasis on traditional scholarship.

Clinical Faculty members may continue their service to BMI and the University without ever seeking promotion to the next higher faculty rank, simply through repeated reappointment at the same level. However, the goals and objectives of the College and the University are best served when all faculty members strive for continuous improvement in all academic areas as measured by meeting or exceeding the requirements for promotion to the next faculty rank.

The awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor to the clinical faculty 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. Clinical faculty members typically pursue careers as clinician scholars or clinician educators.

a. Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor on the clinical faculty – clinician-educator pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition as an educator since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of national recognition and impact should be related to biomedical informatics education, but can also be related to scholarship or professional service. Excellence is not required in all domains. The clinician-educator pathway may reflect effectiveness as an educator of trainees at any level.

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway

TEACHING AND MENTORING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of consistently positive teaching evaluations by students, trainees, and peers. Documented outcomes of mentoring relationships, including the achievements and advancements of mentees.
Leadership in course direction or development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of serving as a course director or developing new courses, including course materials, curriculum design, and student feedback.
Innovation in teaching methodologies and modalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of innovative teaching practices such as curriculum/web-based design and implementation, teaching modules, and digital media. Examples of innovative teaching practices and their adoption or recognition within the field.
National impact and recognition as an educator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invitations to serve as faculty in national educational activities or leadership roles in education-related societies. Recognition or awards received for educational contributions on a national level. Participation as a co-I or collaborative leader in externally funded educational initiatives, supported by federal agencies or industry and private sector sponsors, may contribute to emerging national recognition and demonstrate growing impact in academic education.
Improvement of educational processes or outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the impact of teaching and mentoring activities, such as enhancements in educational processes, learning outcomes, or curricular innovations. Documentation of teaching awards or honors that reflect excellence in education and mentoring.
Contribution to cultural competence and accessibility in education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiatives or programs led by faculty members to improve cultural competence or access to education. Documentation of the impact of these efforts on the educational environment in the classroom, or enhanced cultural understanding among students and faculty.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Administrative service to the University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership roles in university committees or programs that contribute to the administrative functions of the University.
Program development relating to clinical, administrative, or leadership activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of significant contributions to developing or enhancing clinical programs, administrative processes, or leadership initiatives. Impact of these programs on patient care, clinical training, or administrative efficiency.
Professional service to the faculty member's discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement in peer manuscript reviews, editorial boards, or grant application reviews. Leadership positions or active roles in professional societies or organizations related to the candidate's specialty.
Contribution to public and private entities beyond the University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of professional expertise through consultative roles or services to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. Impact of these contributions on policy, practice, or public health.
Development of innovative programs advancing the university's mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership in creating and sustaining programs delivering healthcare to the community or addressing societal problems. Document the program's objectives, activities, and outcomes, demonstrating its impact on the community or targeted populations.
Leadership positions in professional societies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of election or appointment to significant roles within professional societies, reflecting national or international recognition and leadership in the field.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Contributions to scholarship with a focus on education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer-reviewed journal publications, book chapters, or review papers focused on innovative teaching techniques and education theory. Developing and disseminating web-based or video-teaching modules are considered published works.
Impact of scholarship on BMI education or professional practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document the significance and impact of scholarly works, including citations, adoption of methods, or implementation in educational or clinical settings. Evidence of contributions with advanced pedagogical practices or clinical standards.
National level of impact and recognition in scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invitations to present at national conferences, workshops, or symposia based on scholarly contributions. Recognition or awards from professional societies or institutions for contributions to the field.
Peer-reviewed publications and other scholarly outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of 5-10 scholarly written or digital publications since the appointment as an assistant professor, demonstrating a consistent and impactful scholarly output. In cases of fewer outputs, evidence of high-impact publications in respected journals.
Merit in collaborative and team-based scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions to team science or collaborative projects where the faculty member's expertise was essential. Recognition of the faculty member's role in collaborative scholarship, not necessarily limited to first or senior authorship, but where their contribution was critical to the project's success.
Development of educational content and methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of innovative educational content, such as new curricula, teaching methods, or evaluation tools, that peers have adopted or recognized. Impact of these developments on improving educational processes, outcomes, or accessibility.

b. Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of professor on the clinical faculty – clinician-educator pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of leadership or international recognition since appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor. Evidence of international recognition or national leadership should be related to the primary focus of the pathway (didactic education). However, it can also be related to clinical, scholarly activities, or professional service. Excellence is not required in all domains.

Promotion to Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway

TEACHING and MENTORING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustained teaching and mentoring excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple teaching awards and recognitions showcasing sustained excellence. Long-term positive evaluations from students, residents, fellows, and peers.
Impact on teaching and training programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence in developing impactful, innovative programs integrating teaching, research, and patient care.

TEACHING and MENTORING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions to curriculum/web-based innovation, new teaching modalities, and methods of evaluating teaching effectiveness.
National leadership in education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership roles in national education committees or professional societies, such as the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education or the American Medical Informatics Association's Academic Forum. Organization of national courses and curricula and participation in specialty boards.
Mentorship of junior faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented evidence of mentoring activities and the resultant impact on junior faculty members' careers. Examples of career development activities led for other faculty members.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Service to the institution, profession, and community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership roles on university committees or in program development that contribute to clinical, administrative, or educational missions. Development of innovative programs that advance the university's mission, such as community healthcare initiatives.
National and international professional service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership positions in professional societies. Contributions to peer reviews, editorial boards, and development of professional standards.
Provision of professional expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultative roles to public and private entities beyond the University, impacting policy or practice. Invitations to serve as external evaluators for promotion candidates from peer institutions, reflecting national reputation.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Contributions to education-focused scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of 10-15 scholarly written or digital publications since the last promotion, focusing on innovative teaching techniques, education theory, or clinical community-based educational efforts. Development of web-based or video-teaching modules acknowledged as published works.
National or international recognition in scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invitations to present at national conferences, workshops, or symposia based on scholarly contributions. Recognition or awards from professional societies or institutions for contributions to the field. Highly impactful publications in respected journals or widely adopted educational resources. Sustained leadership as a PI or program leader on externally funded educational initiatives, supported by federal agencies or industry and private sector sponsors, provides strong evidence of national or international recognition and significant impact in educational scholarship or innovation.
Integration of clinical expertise into scholarly work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publications based on areas of clinical expertise that inform teaching and contribute to the field. Scholarly work, such as review papers, book chapters, and original studies demonstrating an integration of professional practice and pedagogy.
Collaborative and team-based scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions to team science or collaborative educational projects where the faculty member's expertise significantly influenced the outcome. Works where the faculty member's role was essential, even if not in first or senior author positions, are valued for their merit.
Scholarly engagement with industry or non-traditional partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration with industry or other external entities in the development of educational content, platforms, or clinical research programs.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of scholarly outputs (e.g., patents, funded training programs, team-based deliverables) resulting from such partnerships

c. Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor on the clinical faculty - clinician-scholar pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition as a clinical scholar since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of national recognition and impact should be related to the primary focus of this pathway (scholarship). This recognition can also be related to professional practice, educational, or professional service, but is not required in these other domains.

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway

TEACHING AND MENTORING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Effective teaching and mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently positive evaluations from students, residents, fellows, local colleagues, and national peers. Contributions to curriculum development and co-teaching within the department.
Broad educational contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluations from various educational contributions, including classroom presentations, scientific conference tutorials, and medical center presentations. Documentation of peer evaluations regularly.
Recognition of teaching efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching awards and honors (if any), supporting a strong teaching record. Invitations to present educational content at other academic institutions or scientific meetings.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
National reputation and impact on scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of 20-35 peer-reviewed publications since my appointment as an assistant professor, demonstrating national impact and recognition. Evidence of interdisciplinary research contributions and leadership in collaborative, multidisciplinary research projects.
An essential role in published research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of an essential role in peer-reviewed manuscripts, study protocols, scholarly review articles, and case reports. Recognition of first, senior, and other significant authorship positions that indicate leadership and major research contributions.
External funding support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Record of support as lead personnel (PI, MPI, Co-I, or key scientific role) on multiple externally and internally funded grants, programs, contracts, and projects, including those funded by federal agencies or by industry/private sector sponsors in collaborative or team science settings. Evidence of high-quality contributions to grant proposals, including positive feedback from study section reviewers and supporting letters from collaborators.
Entrepreneurship and inventorship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrations of entrepreneurship or inventorship as evidence of scholarly activity, including patents, licenses, or involvement in startup companies.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Administrative and professional service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership roles in university committees, program development, and professional societies. Contributions to peer reviews and editorial boards, and developing innovative programs that advance the university's mission.
Contribution to public and private entities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of professional expertise through consultative roles or services to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. Impact of these contributions on policy, practice, or public health.
Development of innovative programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership in creating and sustaining programs delivering healthcare to the community or addressing societal challenges. Document the program's objectives, activities, and outcomes, demonstrating its impact on the community or targeted populations.

d. Clinical Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of professor on the clinical faculty-scholar pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed national leadership or international recognition as a clinician scholar since being appointed to the rank of associate professor. Evidence of national leadership or international recognition and impact should be related to the primary focus of this pathway (scholarship). It can also be related to clinical, educational, or professional services, but is not required in all domains.

Promotion to Clinical Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway

TEACHING AND MENTORING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Consistent and sustained effective teaching/ mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive evaluations from a broad audience, including students, residents, fellows, local colleagues, and national peers, reflect sustained teaching excellence. Documentation of peer evaluations regularly.
Curriculum development and co-teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of significant contributions to curriculum development and active involvement in co-teaching within the department.

Engagement in programs enhancing cultural competence and teaching access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development or leadership in programs to improve cultural competence or increase access to teaching for underserved populations, with documented outcomes and impact.
Mentorship of junior faculty and trainees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented mentorship relationships with junior faculty and trainees, including evidence of mentorship in training grants (e.g., NIH T32 or K-awards). Demonstrated impact on mentees' careers and professional development.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustained and expanded impact on scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of 25-40 peer-reviewed publications since promotion to Associate Professor, demonstrating a broad and significant impact in the field. First, senior, and other significant authorship positions that reflect substantial contributions and leadership in research.
National leadership or international	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of national leadership or international recognition, such as invitations to serve on study sections, keynote addresses at national meetings, and leadership roles in scientific societies.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
recognition in clinical scholarship	
Contributions to interdisciplinary research and team science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated leadership in collaborative health science, particularly in interdisciplinary efforts within basic, clinical, or translational science. • Clear articulation of independent research contributions and the impact of those contributions, supported by collaborative publications where the candidate's role was essential.
External funding support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of substantial external funding (as PI, MPI, Co-I, or in a key scientific leadership role) from federal agencies or industry/private sector sponsors, demonstrating national recognition and leadership in clinical scholarship or team-based research. • High-quality contributions to grant proposals, evidenced by positive reviewer feedback and supporting letters from collaborators.
Entrepreneurship and inventorship as scholarly activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrations of entrepreneurship or inventorship, including patents, licenses, startup company involvement, or other scholarly activity outside traditional publications.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Service to the University and in a national context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased levels of responsibility and leadership within the University, such as committee chairs or program development leaders. • Leadership or elected office in national or international organizations, reflecting significant professional contributions.
Development of innovative programs with national recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in creating and implementing innovative programs that received national recognition. • Documents of the essential role in these programs that advance the university's mission or address societal challenges.
Contribution to professional service and community engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active involvement in peer reviews, editorial boards, and professional societies, contributing to the advancement of the field. • Development and leadership in programs delivering healthcare to the community with documented impact and outcomes.

2. Promotion of Research Faculty

The criteria for promotion focus entirely on the category of research. Since research faculty typically have a supportive role in research programs, the expectations for a scholarship are quantitatively and qualitatively different than those for faculty on the tenure track.

a. Research Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to research associate professor are expected to demonstrate the beginnings of national recognition of their expertise. This may be reflected by (but not limited to) invitations to review manuscripts or grant applications, invitations to lecture at scientific societies or other universities, consultation with industry or governmental agencies, requests for collaboration from other universities, and requests to serve in central roles on multi-center studies, etc.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
National recognition of expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations to review manuscripts or grant applications, lecture at scientific societies or other universities, and consult with industry or governmental agencies. • Requests for collaboration from other universities and roles in multi-center studies.
Sustained and substantial record of scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-25 peer-reviewed journal publications since appointment as research assistant professor, demonstrating a sustained contribution to the field. • Evidence that the faculty member's work has significantly contributed to new knowledge in their field, considering the quality and quantity of publications.
Contribution to collaborative research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of contributions to research projects, particularly in roles that support and enhance the research, such as Co-I or significant collaborator. • Recognition by peers for research contributions, which could include co-authorship on publications, acknowledgments, or supporting letters from collaborators.

FUNDING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustained salary recovery from extramural sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of 100% salary recovery from extramural sources, including federally funded agencies or industry and private sector sponsors, demonstrating sustained financial support for the candidate's research activities.
Role in securing research funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of roles in securing funding for research projects, such as Co-I or significant collaborator on projects funded by federal, foundation, or industry/private sector sources. • While independent extramural funding as PI or MPI is not required, any such roles, particularly those involving competitive grants, contracts, or industry-sponsored research, should be documented as supportive evidence of research leadership and impact.

b. Research Professor

The awarding of promotion to the rank of research professor must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has established a national level of recognition and impact beyond that which was established for promotion to associate professor. This may be reflected by (but not limited to) invitations to review manuscripts or grant applications, invitations to lecture at scientific societies or other universities, consultation with industry or governmental agencies, requests for collaboration from other universities, and requests to serve in central roles on multi-center studies, etc.

Promotion to Research Professor

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
National recognition and impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of national recognition and impact, including invitations to review manuscripts or grant applications, lectures at scientific societies or other universities, and consultation with industry or governmental agencies. • Requests for collaboration from other universities and central roles in multi-center studies.
Sustained and substantial record of scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25-35 peer-reviewed journal publications since promotion to research associate professor, demonstrating an advanced contribution to the field. • Some publications where the candidate is the first, senior, or corresponding author reflect a significant role in the research. • In cases of fewer publications, evidence that some are highly impactful and published in respected journals.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that the faculty member's work has substantially contributed to new knowledge in their field, considering the quality and quantity of publications. • Recognition by peers for research contributions, which could include co-authorship on publications, acknowledgments, or supporting letters from collaborators.

FUNDING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustained salary recovery from extramural sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of 100% salary recovery from extramural sources since the promotion to research associate professor, demonstrating sustained financial support for the candidate's research activities. Extramural sources may include federal agencies, national foundations, or industry and private sector sponsors.
Role in securing research funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of significant roles in securing funding for research projects, such as Co-Investigator or significant collaborator on federally or industry-funded projects. • Documentation of contributions to grant applications and funded research, highlighting the candidate's role and impact on the research. • While independent extramural funding as PI or MPI is not required, any such roles, particularly on competitive federal or industry-sponsored awards, should be documented as evidence of research leadership

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track and clinical faculty (see Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if BMI chair's recommendation is negative and does not proceed to the University level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

For associated faculty, promotion should reflect contributions to BMI or the College that exceed the activities that represent the basis for their faculty appointment, in most cases related to the educational mission. At the senior lecturer and associate professor levels, this could include service on BMI and or college committees, contributions to medical student curriculum development, or other evidence of contributions to the educational or scholarly mission of BMI or college. For promotion to professor, the level of contribution must demonstrate sustained and enhanced engagement or leadership.

Procedures for the promotion of associated faculty:

- Submission of an updated CV
- A letter from two people, including the faculty member's immediate supervisor (i.e., division director or clerkship director), who can attest to the associated faculty member's contributions.
- Teaching evaluations, if available
- Letter from the committee of eligible faculty including the vote.
- Letter from the chair
- Review and approval by the College of Medicine Office of Academic Affairs.

B. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Review: Procedures for Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty

BMI's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

1. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for (1) submitting a complete, accurate dossier and (2) providing a copy of the AP&T 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 (3) reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case by the Department.

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 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure 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 or her. Please refer to the [APT Toolbox](#) for a wealth of information on completing a dossier.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to the present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is less, to the present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment 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 or reappointment 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 the present. For tenured or non-probationary

faculty, it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to the present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond BMI.

Publications

Candidates may supply up to three (3) publications that will be included in the Dossier and provided to external reviewers. These publications should ideally come from the period since their last appointment. Clinical faculty on the teaching or excellence pathway

Internal letters

Candidates may also request that internal letters or collaborator letters be included in the dossier. A request for the inclusion of such a letter can be made at the time of submitting their dossier for external review.

Documentation

Faculty members preparing their dossiers for promotion and/or tenure review should consult Chapter 3 of OAA's [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) to ensure that all required documentation is included. The following paragraphs provide suggested 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 the College of Medicine, teaching must be consistently effective and of high quality. All Tenure Track and Clinical faculty members in the College of Medicine must be engaged in teaching, the development of BMI's and the College's academic programs, and mentoring of students and trainees. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated by documentation of teaching activities over a sustained period of time.

A faculty member's quality and effectiveness as a teacher will be documented and assessed through multiple means, including peer evaluation, student evaluation of the instructor, peer review of course documents, and teaching awards.

Yearly, student evaluations, resident & fellow evaluations (when applicable), and peer evaluations, at a minimum, are required. Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated by positive evaluations from students, trainees, local colleagues, and national peers. These evaluations include student evaluation of instructors (SEIs) and BMI peer evaluation forms and letters written specifically for peer evaluation. The administration of an assessment tool will not be under the control of the faculty member being evaluated. Faculty members may supplement the required

assessment tool with others if they wish. Students and trainees must be provided with an opportunity to assess the instructor and course using the required assessment tool in every regular classroom course. Regardless of the instructional setting, effort should be made to obtain evaluations from the largest number of students and trainees possible. When there is a significant discrepancy between the number of students and trainees enrolled and the number providing evaluations, the evaluations cannot be assumed to represent a consensus of student opinion.

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

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every formal class
- Medical student evaluations, if applicable (e.g., Vitals)
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by BMI's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix to this document)
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier, including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, 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

Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members. Peer evaluations may include internal and/or external reviews 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.

For every course that a faculty member directs, a peer review will be arranged by the Graduate Studies Coordinating Committee to ensure that the responsibility for arranging for and carrying out peer review activities does not rely on the faculty members themselves. The presence of yearly peer evaluation will be verified at the faculty member's annual review.

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.

Peer evaluation resources can be found [here](#):

Scholarship

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

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

Scholarship is broadly defined, including all aspects of basic science, clinical research, including clinical trials and research based on cases or case series, educational outcomes research, development of academic modules, entrepreneurship, etc. The nature of the scholarship should be pertinent to the faculty member's track and pattern of responsibilities. In addition, BMIs should incorporate mechanisms to recognize new and emerging methods of dissemination of scholarship, including websites, social media, etc.

Evidence of scholarship can include but is not limited to peer-reviewed journal articles, bulletins, and technical reports, original books and monographs, edited books, chapters in edited books, editor-reviewed journal articles, reviews, and abstracts, papers in proceedings, unpublished scholarly presentations, externally funded research, funded training grants, other funding for academic work, prizes and awards for research or scholarly or creative work, major professional awards and commendations. Evidence of scholarship may also include invited lectures at other universities, symposia, and conferences; invention disclosures, patent activity, entrepreneurship, technology commercialization, software development; editorship of a major collection of research work; leadership of advanced seminars and symposia under organizational sponsorship; and invitations to serve on national review bodies. BMIs 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, 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 BMIs or academic health centers, and so forth.

Service

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, exemplary patient care or application of the methodology, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. In the College of Medicine, a candidate's service contributions must be demonstrated to be of high quality and effectiveness. All tenure-track 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 BMI, College, and/or University committees, holding administrative positions, development of innovative programs, and participating in mentoring activities. Program Development, reflecting the integration of teaching, service, and research in a specific content area, may be given special recognition and significance if desired by BMI. 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 services to professional societies. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University includes serving as a reviewer of grants or other scholarly proposals, an external examiner or advisor, a panel and commission participant, and a professional consultant to industry, government, and education. While the provision of high-quality patient care or method application 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.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must indicate the AP&T document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed using BMI's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the AP&T document that was in effect on their start date or (b) the AP&T document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or reappointment in the case of 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 ten years before April 1 of the review year. If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an AP&T document other than the currently approved version available [here](#), a copy of the AP&T document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to BMI.

External Evaluations (see also External evaluations below)

Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names (one for clinical excellence and clinician educator) but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the

removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The BMI chair (or their designee) decides whether removal is justified.

2. **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee Responsibilities**

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

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in the 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 an assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV or dossier 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 a necessary and sufficient ground on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only 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 non-probationary clinical and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on a 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 BMI chair, or any other party to the review to make a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through the early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs' [annual procedural guidelines](#).
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external or internal evaluators to BMI chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VII.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
 - **Late Spring:** The candidate should be shown the list of potential evaluators by the Promotion & Tenure committee chair 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.

- **Summer:** Gather internal evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service from students and peers, as appropriate, within BMI.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements, and work with candidates to ensure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate with an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- 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 fully 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.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to BMI chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The fully eligible faculty do not vote on these cases since BMI's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

3. Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

In the event that BMI does not have at least three faculty members who are eligible to conduct the review, the BMI Chair must contact the Office of Academic Affairs in the College to identify appropriate faculty members from other departments that will supplement the eligible faculty within BMI.

The responsibilities of the members of the Eligible Faculty Committee are as follows:

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in the 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, or designee, will write a letter on behalf of the committee to BMI 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 member at the appropriate rank per University Faculty Rules.

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

4. Department Chair Responsibilities

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 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.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, the BMI chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on the impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit. Such a letter will also be sought for Discovery Theme hires and for faculty who complete most of their duties in a Center or Institute. The Department chair will also review requests by the candidate for other internal letters (e.g., collaborator letters) and solicit them when appropriate. Finally, internal letters may be required to assess the contributions and impact of team science and practice activities of clinical faculty on the excellence pathway.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- 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.
- Following receipt of the letter of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and vote, to provide an independent written evaluation and conclusion regarding if a candidate's dossier meets the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendations of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after the completion of the BMI review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and the Department chair

- of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and the Department chair
- 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.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant a response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the eligible faculty'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 Department chair or director of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

5. Promotion Review: Procedures for Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles is a possibility following the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VII.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if Department chair's recommendation is negative and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

6. External Evaluations

External evaluations are obtained for all promotion and/or tenure reviews. As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure 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." In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate does not agree to write, neither the university Office of Academic Affairs nor the Department require that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department will seek external evaluations primarily from evaluators in peer and aspirational peer programs that are clearly identified in this document. Peer programs represent institutions with similar academic focus, scope, and performance, while aspirational peers are recognized for their leadership, innovative approaches, and distinguished reputations in the field, serving as models that the department aspires to emulate.

The following programs have been identified as peer institutions based on similar size, focus, and academic achievements:

- University of Wisconsin-Madison: Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
- Indiana University: Department of Biostatistics and Data Science.

- University of Texas at Houston: School of Informatics
- University of Pennsylvania: Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Informatics
- Stanford University: Department of Biomedical Data Science.

The aspirational peer programs identified below reflect institutions with significant reputations for excellence in research, teaching, and innovation in biomedical informatics, setting the standard the department seeks to attain:

- Vanderbilt University: Department of Biomedical Informatics
- Columbia University: Department of Biomedical Informatics
- Harvard University: Department of Biomedical Informatics
- University of Pittsburgh: Department of Biomedical Informatics
- University of Michigan: Department of Computational Medicine and Bioinformatics
- University of Southern California: Department of Quantitative and Computational Biology

These peer and aspirational peer programs will serve as the primary sources for external evaluations. Justification will be provided whenever a suggested evaluator is from a program not included in the list above.

This structured approach ensures that evaluations are sought from programs that align with the department's performance goals, while also reflecting the department's commitment to continuous improvement and alignment with top-tier academic institutions.

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 (three for clinical excellence and clinician educator pathways). A credible and useful evaluation:

a) Is written by a person who has no conflict of interest as described above and is highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant). 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. 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 with 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.

c) In the event that a unit is unable to obtain the required number of external evaluations, the unit 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 unit 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 (three for clinical excellence and clinician educator pathways) will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, P&T chair, and the Department chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and agree that it will not constitute a procedural error.

Since BMI cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are 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.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, the Department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate does not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this BMI requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

BMI follows the Office of Academic Affairs' suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for clinical faculty can 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 Department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (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 BMI's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

VIII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

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.

IX. Reviews in the Final Year of Probation

In most instances, a decision to deny promotion and tenure in the penultimate probationary year (6th year) is considered final. However, in rare instances in which there is substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is relevant to the reasons for the original negative decision, a seventh-year review may be conducted. The request for this review must come from the eligible faculty and the head of BMI and may not come from the faculty member themselves. Details of the criteria and procedures for a review in the final year of probation are described in University Rule [3335-6-05](#) (B).

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in BMI. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if they are going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for

performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

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

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary clinical associate 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.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary 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.
- to review, upon the Department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need to provide assistance in improving teaching.
- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Peer evaluation of teaching may occur in many different venues, as applicable to a faculty member's primary teaching responsibility. The College of Medicine broadly considers teaching medical students, undergraduate students, graduate students, residents, and fellows. Faculty members may be evaluated in activities including but not limited to giving live didactic lectures, listening to recorded lectures or online modules, continuing education courses, or workshops, whether at Ohio State or elsewhere.

The peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the evaluation, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the Department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report, and the reviewer may respond if they wish. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

XI. Appendices

A. Glossary of Terms

Adjunct Faculty – Adjunct faculty appointments, which may be compensated or uncompensated, are granted to individuals who provide academic service to the department, such as teaching courses and serving on graduate student committees. An adjunct faculty appointment is not the same as a **Courtesy Appointment** (See also Associated Faculty).

APT – Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

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

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

Associated – a broad category of faculty that encompasses adjunct, visiting, and lecturers who are typically intended to be short-term appointments. (See also Adjunct Faculty)

Collaborative research / Team science - distinctive contributions made to a team of investigators that result in publications and grants. These contributions are recognizable by extramural consultants and other evaluators. Individual investigators must be able to identify the unique, original, and expert skills and ideas they have contributed to a particular project.

Community engagement - institutional, local, national, and international community contributions that are closely aligned with and complementary to the candidate's scholarly academic achievements. These activities reflect innovations made in science, medicine, and/or healthcare that led to demonstrable advances in knowledge, health (individual or population), healthcare, or healthcare delivery.

Courtesy Appointment – a no-salary appointment for a clinical, research, or tenure-track faculty member from another academic department within the University. The title associated with the no-salary appointment is always the same as the faculty's title in their home TIU.

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

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

Extension of the Tenure Clock (formally known as Exclusion of Time) – the ability to have up to three years added to the time clock toward achieving tenure.

Faculty – the College of Medicine has four faculty types: Tenure Track, Clinical faculty, Research faculty, and the Associated faculty.

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

Impact – the direct effect of an individual's work on science, medicine, health care, patient care and/or community. It can be assessed by a variety of metrics.

Institutional Citizenship – participation in service missions relevant to a faculty member's academic activities and to the missions of the College of Medicine and the University. It includes, but is not limited to, efforts in mentoring, professionalism, and DEI.

Joint Appointment – when a faculty member's FTE (and salary support) is split between one or more academic TIUs it is considered to be a joint appointment (this is different than a **Courtesy Appointment**).

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

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

National Recognition – could be based on geographic considerations (i.e., outside of Ohio) or on the basis of national ranking for the discipline.

Non-mandatory review – voluntary promotion or tenure review.

OAA – Office of Academic Affairs (University).

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

Penultimate year – the next to last year of a contract, used to determine required clinical and research faculty review dates. See also reappointment review below.

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

Probationary period – the length of time in which a faculty member on the tenure-track has to achieve tenure (e.g., 6 years for assistant professor faculty without clinical service, 11 years for assistant professor faculty with significant clinical service responsibilities). It is also defined as the first appointment term for faculty on the Clinical faculty or Research faculty. Once they have been reappointed, they are no longer probationary. During the probationary period, faculty are reviewed annually and informed whether their appointment will be continued.

Professionalism - exemplary behavior including demonstration of honesty and integrity in all realms of work; respect for patients, faculty, staff, and learners at all levels; evidence of commitment to continued learning and personal betterment; the encouragement of questions, debate and acceptance of viewpoints without demonstration of prejudice or bias. Maintenance

of these behaviors is consistent with the values of The Ohio State University and the College of Medicine.

Reappointment Review – the review of a clinical, research, or associated faculty member in the penultimate year of their contract to determine if the contract will be renewed. See also the penultimate year above.

Clinical Faculty – the faculty who primarily engage in clinical, teaching and practice.

Research Faculty –for basic scientist faculty who engage exclusively in research-based scholarship.

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

Trajectory – continued momentum and growth in pursuit of an individual's career path. It is expected that one's career trajectory continues to ascend over time. Promotion anticipates sustained upward trajectory and continuing impact. The trajectory is interpreted within the context of mitigating life circumstances.

SEI – Student Evaluation of Instruction.

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

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

B AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and state the truth as they see it. To this end, professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision on the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

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

C. BMI Criteria and Types of Evidence for Promotion and Tenure

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Scholarship: Demonstration of national recognition and impact for an independent thematic program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to associate professor and the award of tenure. Candidates must also demonstrate the impact of the scholarship, not just the potential for impact. Independence must be reflected in the record of scholarship. Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery, development, and dissemination of new knowledge and/or methods. Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by: i. a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings or reflected in entrepreneurship (patents/intellectual property); ii. sustained obtainment of extramural funding; and iii. the achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact within their field of endeavor.

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion and tenure decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements since appointment to the tenure track at The Ohio State University. Evidence of scholarship below the specified range does not preclude a positive promotion decision, especially if reasonable extenuating circumstances exist. Furthermore, scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive tenure or promotion decision, especially if it occurs in isolation or in the

context of poor performance in other areas, such as evidence of teaching excellence.

Faculty may be involved in a range of scholarly activities that can include individual contributions, developing a lab, leading a core, and/or being engaged in team science. As long as faculty can document their own contributions to scholarship and their impact, the department does not favor one career path over another, nor does it view the paths as mutually exclusive or fixed for the duration of the candidate's career.

Publications

A sustained record of scholarly productivity, reflected by both quality and quantity, as an assistant professor, is required for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Candidates should ideally have 15-25 relevant peer-reviewed publications since their appointment as assistant professors. The candidate must demonstrate that they play a critical and essential role in driving the research forward in a substantial number of these publications (see below for definition). The pattern of scholarship should display an increasing propensity for the faculty to be one of the authors driving the research. For faculty who pursue independent research, this substantial number of publications are first, senior, or corresponding authors, and at least two such publications (first, senior, or corresponding author) should appear in journals with an impact factor higher than four or impact factors that rank among the top five in their field. Alternative authorship positions may be important for some fields. Candidates should document other important positions within their dossier and provide an explanation of their importance.

It is recognized that specific prestigious journals, including but not limited to Nature and Science, require much higher standards for publication. Peer-reviewed publications in these prestigious journals are highly valued. Candidates' applications could contain fewer publications if their work were published in these prestigious, high-impact journals. The candidate must document evidence of their work's significance and high impact in the dossier and demonstrate their critical and essential role in driving the research field forward.

Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued. In cases where a faculty member's collaborative scholarship results in middle authorship, the recognition and impact of their scholarship will be reflected through other indicators, such as, but not limited to, the indispensability of the candidate's role and contribution in generating the publication. As with any publication with multiple authors, a narrative description of the candidate's intellectual contribution can be used to highlight the importance of contribution for instances of middle authorship. Therefore, when pursuing team science research, the faculty candidate must demonstrate a significant role in a substantial number of multi-authored publications, and some of these publications are first, senior, or corresponding authors. At least two such publications should appear in journals with an impact factor higher than four or impact factors that rank among the top five in their field.

The quantity and quality of publications should be considered. Metrics that are useful in assessing a candidate's record of scholarship include but are not limited to the total number of publications since their appointment as an assistant professor, the number of citations of their publications, the trajectory of the publication and/or citation record, and the relative proportion of significant authorship positions (e.g., first, senior, corresponding, or leading contributor in quantitative science). Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%) and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert

in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles or conference proceedings (especially in fields such as computer science where they are the norm); book chapters or reviews alone or in the majority will not be sufficient for promotion.

The impact factor of a journal may or may not reflect the quality of the scholarship. The best journal in some areas of research may have a relatively low impact factor but may be highly respected or highly cited by peers in that area. Top-ranked journals and their impact factors are not the same across these disciplines. Conversely, publication in journals with a very high impact factor may reflect broad interest but does not in and of itself demonstrate the impact of research. The impact may be demonstrated through non-traditional metrics. This can include, but is not limited to social media penetration, blog subscription, altmetrics score, non-academic invited presentations, collaborations that advance the mission of the university or the field, and interviews by reputable national media outlets on scholarly topics.

In summary, a demonstration of the impact and national reputation of an independent program of research is a prerequisite for promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure.

Externally funded research

Evidence of sustained or multiple external peer-reviewed grant support is a crucial indicator of expertise in the field. Given the multidisciplinary nature of biomedical informatics, there are opportunities to lead independent projects and/or to provide leadership within multidisciplinary, externally supported studies. The Department looks for candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure to demonstrate leadership and independence as either the Principal Investigator (PI) or a Multiple Principal Investigator (MPI) in an R01, P01, U54, or K award. Funding expectations may also be met by both NIH and non-NIH sources (including but not limited to NSF, DoD, USDA, AHRQ, DARPA, RWJF, Commonwealth Fund, Kaiser Family Foundation, or sustainable industry or private sector sponsors). For a faculty candidate who conducts team science research, leadership and independence is demonstrated as a primary leader (e.g., Core Director) in a large team-based research project, such as P01, P50, U54, or other comparable funding. They should ideally have demonstrated the sustainability of their research program by the renewal of the award and/or by garnering a second distinct, nationally competitive, peer-reviewed grant.

Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure who have significant clinical responsibilities are on the 11-year tenure clock. They are expected to obtain extramural NIH or comparable funding as defined in the previous paragraph as a PI or MPI to support their research program prior to their mandatory tenure review. Competitive, peer-reviewed career development award funding, such as an NIH K award or National Foundation career development award, is acceptable. Depending on the extent of clinical responsibilities, sustained funding through pharmaceutical, biotechnology, digital health, or instrumentation companies for investigator-initiated proposals is acceptable when the faculty member serves in a leadership role equivalent to PI or MPI. However, serving as the site-PI for a multi-center trial would not satisfy the expectation for extramural funding on the tenure track. Faculty members who generate support for their research programs through the creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding.

Entrepreneurship

Evidence of entrepreneurship can contribute to the total body of scholarship but is not required of all faculty. Entrepreneurship includes patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, materials transfers, technology commercialization, the formation of startup

companies, and licensing and option agreements. In as much as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, these will be analyzed flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract; patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript; licensing activities that generate revenue should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly activities in the promotion and tenure dossier. Quantifying the impact of published informatics or statistical software can be challenging, but several metrics are available. If accompanied by a publication, the best measure is typically the number of times the publication has been cited. However, the software is often used without being cited, so other indicators of impact should be taken into consideration. In particular, the number of times the software has been downloaded and the frequency with which the software is listed as a dependency by other packages are useful albeit imperfect measures (e.g., Depends/Imports/Suggests, for CRAN packages). Likewise, other distribution platforms often provide measures of software impact (e.g., "stars" on GitHub).

Teaching and Mentoring

A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion and tenure. The teaching effort must be demonstrated as either serving as a course director or a new course development. The teaching performance may be demonstrated by positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and/or national peers. The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. Teaching awards and other honors are also highly supportive of teaching excellence. Teaching effectiveness may also be reflected by the documented impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities such as web-based design, mobile applications, virtual teaching, methods of evaluating teaching, program or course development, publications on teaching, and societal leadership in education. The development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research, and hands-on training is valued. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued.

Service

Candidates must demonstrate effective service at the departmental and collegiate levels. Service includes administrative service to OSU, excellent patient care, clinical program development, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Evidence of service within the institution can include but is not limited to appointment or election to BMI, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups, or leadership of programs. Evidence of service to the faculty member's discipline or public and private entities beyond the University can include, but is not limited to, ad hoc journal reviews, editorial boards, or editorships; grant reviewers for national funding agencies; elected or appointed offices held and other services to local and national professional societies; service on panels and commissions; and professional consultation to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations.

Similarly, innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as the creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community or the design and implementation of a novel program can be considered service activities. Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

Promotion to Professor with Tenure

A sustained record of external funding and enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an associate professor is required for promotion to professor. Candidates for promotion to professor should ideally have an additional 25-40 peer-reviewed publications or proceedings since their promotion to associate professor. In instances where a faculty member's application contains fewer outputs, some of these should be highly impactful and published in highly respected journals, including but not limited to *Nature* and *Science*. Candidates must document evidence of the significance and high impact of their work in the dossier and demonstrate their critical and essential role in driving the research field forward in these publications. For faculty who pursue independent research, a substantial number of publications are first, senior, or corresponding authors. When pursuing team science research, the faculty candidate must demonstrate a significant role in a substantial number of multi-authored publications, and some of these publications are first, senior, or corresponding authors.

Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and current peer-reviewed extramural funding to support their research program, including a sustained level of funding. At a minimum, for faculty candidates who pursue independent research, the promotion to professor must be demonstrated with a PI or multiple-PD/PI on at least one NIH-funded R01 or equivalent grant (e.g., but not limited to NSF, DoD, USDA, AHRQ, DARPA, RWJF, Commonwealth Fund, Kaiser Family Foundation, or industry/private sector sponsors) with a history of at least one competitive renewal, or another nationally competitive grant, or have simultaneous funding on two NIH R01 level awards. Prominent funding from national charitable foundations or competitively awarded industry or private sector research grants may also be acceptable if they reflect the scale, impact, and leadership equivalent to an NIH R01. This may include support from prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., American Heart Association, American Lung Association, American Diabetes Association, American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, the March of Dimes), a major industry grant, or other federal entities such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Defense and the National Science Foundation.

Faculty candidates who pursue team science research, leadership, and independence are demonstrated as primary leaders (e.g., Core Director) in a large team-based research project, such as P01, P50, U54, or other comparable funding, with a history of at least one competitive renewal, or another nationally competitive grant, or have simultaneous funding on two multi-year program project grants or large scale multi-institutional grants. Inclusion of major industry or private sector funding as a Core Leader or equivalent in a nationally recognized team science program may also satisfy this requirement if the funding reflects the scope and rigor of peer-reviewed federal awards. Funding requirements may also be met by a combination of individual and team-science awards.

Examples of evidence of national leadership or an international reputation include but

are not limited to election or appointment to a leadership position of national or international societies, service as a national committee or task force chair, chair of an NIH or other federal review panel, regular membership on an NIH study section, peer recognition or awards for research, editorial boards or editorships of scientific journals, and invited lectures at hospitals or universities outside the country or at meetings of international societies.

Teaching and Mentoring

A continued strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion. The teaching effort must be demonstrated as either serving as a course director or a new course development. Evidence may include but is not limited to an outstanding student, resident, fellow, local colleagues, and/or national peer evaluations, course or workshop leadership and design, a training program directorship, teaching awards, and organization of national course and curricula and participation in specialty boards or Residency Review Committees of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued. Candidates with clinical duties should demonstrate consistent and effective teaching of trainees and practicing clinicians and leadership in the administration of clinical training programs.

Mentorship of junior faculty is expected for promotion to professor. It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship and not just ad hoc career coaching. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their mentorship.

When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

Service

Promotion to the rank of professor requires service to the COM, OSU, and national and international professional societies. Service can include but is not limited to leadership roles on OSU committees, professional organizations, and journal editorships. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise could include roles as a board examiner, service on panels and commissions, program development, and professional consultation to industry, government, and education. Similarly, innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as the creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community or the design can be considered service activities.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments, (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions, and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to a professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make a visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of BMI, college, and university.

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway

Teaching and Mentoring

A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion. The teaching effort must be demonstrated as either serving as a course director or new course development. Effectiveness may be measured by various metrics, including, but not limited to, curriculum/web-based design and implementation, innovative teaching practices, modules, and publications. Consistently positive teaching evaluations by students, trainees, and peers are required. Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section). Effectiveness may also be reflected by teaching awards or other honors. Clinician Educators may also demonstrate national impact through invitations to serve as faculty on societal leadership in education or other national activities. In all cases, evidence of improved educational processes or outcomes (i.e., impact) is required. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued.

Service

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, program development relating to clinical, administrative, leadership, and related activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Professional service could include but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, service on editorial boards, service to the community as pertains to the candidate's specialty, development of innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community, or design and implementation of a novel program, and leadership positions in professional societies.

Scholarship

The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed journal publications. Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their scholarship. Faculty in the Clinician Educator Pathway may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain. Examples include papers regarding innovative teaching techniques, scholarly review articles, and book chapters focused on education theory, new curricula, and methods of evaluation. Alternatively, other faculty members in the Clinician Educator Pathway may publish work based on their areas of expertise, which forms the basis for their teaching to colleagues and peers. These may include, but are not limited to, review papers, book chapters, as well as original investigator-initiated studies related to their area. Some faculty members may combine these two areas of career emphasis. For both types of faculty careers, the development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are considered to be published works. In the current era of team and collaborative scholarship, it is recognized that meaningful scholarship is not uniformly represented by first or senior authorship. Work in which the faculty member's individual and identifiable expertise was essential to the publication is regarded as having merit equivalent to that of the first or senior author. Participation as a co-investigator or collaborative leader in externally funded educational initiatives, including those supported by federal agencies or industry and private sector sponsors, may further support scholarly impact and emerging national recognition. A range of 5-10 scholarly written or digital publications of this type since appointment as an assistant professor is suggested as a scope of work consistent with promotion to associate professor. However, this range does not represent an inflexible requirement for a promotion. In instances where a clinical faculty member's

application contains fewer outputs, some of these should be highly impactful and published in highly respected journals.

Promotion to Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway

Teaching and Mentoring

A documented record of sustained teaching and mentoring excellence is required for promotion. Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their teaching and mentoring. The teaching effort must be demonstrated as either serving as a course director or in new course development. Sustained positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, local colleagues, and/or national peers are required. Multiple teaching awards and other honors are indicative of this level of teaching excellence, but are not required. Candidates must demonstrate a favorable impact on teaching and training programs, such as curriculum/web-based innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and/or program or course development. Other examples include the development of multiple impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research, and patient care. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued. Teaching excellence may also be demonstrated through committee appointments in national education committees such as the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, National Medical Association, American Association of Higher Education, Association of American Colleges and Universities, or Association of American Medical Colleges. This also includes committee appointments or leadership positions in professional societies at the national level, such as the American Medical Informatics Association's Academic Forum.

Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered for the rank of professor. Candidates should demonstrate evidence of mentoring or other career development activities for other faculty members.

Service

Service to the institution and profession is an expectation for promotion to professor. Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, patient care, program development relating to clinical, administrative, leadership, and related activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Professional service could include but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, service on editorial boards, and development of innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as the creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community, and leadership positions in professional societies. In addition, invitations to serve as external evaluators for promotion candidates from peer institutions are a reflection of national reputation.

Scholarship

The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed journal publications. Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their scholarship. Faculty in the Clinician Educator Pathway may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain. Examples include papers regarding innovative teaching techniques, scholarly review articles, and book chapters focused on education theory, new curricula and methods of evaluation, or clinical community-based educational efforts. Alternatively, other faculty members in the Clinician Educator Pathway may publish work based on their areas of clinical expertise, which form the basis for their teaching to colleagues and peers. These may include but are not limited to, review papers, book chapters, as well as

original investigator-initiated studies related to their area of clinical or applied methods practice. Some faculty members may combine these two areas of career emphasis.

Development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are considered to be published works. In the current era of team and collaborative scholarship, it is recognized that meaningful scholarship is not uniformly represented by first or senior authorship. Works in which the faculty member's individual and identifiable expertise was essential to the publication are regarded as having merit equivalent to those that are the first or senior author.

Leadership as a principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or program director on externally funded educational initiatives, including those supported by federal agencies, national foundations, or industry and private sector sponsors—may provide strong evidence of scholarly impact, educational innovation, and national recognition.

A range of 10–15 scholarly written or digital publications of this type since appointment or promotion to associate professor is suggested as a scope of work consistent with promotion to professor. However, this range does not represent an inflexible requirement for a promotion. In instances where a faculty member's application contains fewer outputs, some of them should be highly impactful and published in highly respected journals.

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway

Teaching and Mentoring

Consistent evidence of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion. Faculty members are expected to contribute to curriculum development and co-teach courses within the department. Effectiveness in teaching may be demonstrated through positive evaluations from students, residents, fellows, local colleagues, and/or national peers. While teaching evaluations should primarily focus on classroom presentations, they can also encompass other forms of educational contributions. These may include evaluations from presentations delivered either internally or at other academic institutions, as well as presentations or tutorials at scientific conferences or meetings, presentations at other medical centers or hospitals, and similar contributions. While teaching awards and other honors are also supportive of a strong teaching record, they are not mandatory. Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members.

Scholarship

Demonstration of impact and a national reputation for the scholarship is a prerequisite for promotion to associate professor. The dossier will require the demonstration of impact, not just the potential for impact. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued on the clinician-scholar pathway. The candidate is encouraged to focus interdisciplinary efforts in a small number of areas to gain a deeper understanding of the underlying science, which should improve the quality and relevance of the research contributions. Relevant interdisciplinary contributions such as determining the most appropriate analytical techniques to use in designing a study and in modeling data, are scientific research activities that require leadership, expertise, and innovation. The candidate must demonstrate scholarship typically as reflected primarily by an essential role in peer-reviewed published manuscripts but could also include study protocols, training manuals, manuals of operating procedures, scholarly review articles, and case reports. While first and senior author papers are considered highly, other authorship positions (e.g., second, third, second to last) supportive of leadership and major contributions in collaborative research are also highly valued. However, because interdisciplinary publications often feature a large number of authors, the candidate

who played a crucial role in the research may appear virtually anywhere in the author list. While contributions to papers and projects will vary, the candidate should clearly articulate and provide supportive evidence demonstrating the independence of the research contributions and the impact of those contributions on the interdisciplinary research. Evidence from other domains that demonstrate the faculty member's unique expertise at the national level (e.g., invitations to speak at national meetings, etc.) is important in this regard. In general, a range of 20-35 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an assistant professor is expected. Although review articles may provide supportive evidence of a faculty member's expertise in a field and form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%), a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles. Book chapters or reviews alone or in the majority will not be sufficient for promotion. In instances where a faculty member's application contains fewer outputs, some of them should be highly impactful and published in highly respected journals.

Faculty on this pathway are expected to have acquired external funding (as PI, MPI, Co-I, or key scientific role, e.g., as a biostatistician, bioinformatician, or informatician) in support of their program of scholarship. Such funding may be obtained from federal agencies, national foundations, or industry and private sector sponsors, provided that the faculty member holds a substantial leadership or scientific role and the funding is competitive and peer-reviewed or equivalently vetted. The candidate should have a record of support as the lead personnel in their focus area (e.g., biostatistics, bioinformatics, informatics) on multiple externally and/or internally funded grants, programs, contracts, and/or projects. Evidence of meaningful contributions to externally funded, interdisciplinary research teams, especially those supported by federal or industry/private sector sources, should be documented through the candidate's defined scientific role and the impact of the work. The impact of the role that the faculty has on these studies should be demonstrated, taking into consideration both the quality and quantity of the candidate's contributions. High-quality contributions to grant proposals are also important for highly collaborative team scientists. In such cases, evidence provided by positive feedback from study section reviewers and supporting letters from collaborators can attest to the quality of the contribution. Alternatively, entrepreneurship and inventorship are also evidence of scholarly activity.

Service

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, program development relating to clinical, administrative, leadership, and related activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Professional service could include, but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, serving on editorial boards, developing innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, and leadership positions in professional societies.

Promotion to Clinical Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway

Teaching and Mentoring

Consistent and sustained evidence of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion to the rank of professor. Faculty members are expected to engage in curriculum development and co-teach courses within the department. Programs aimed at improving the cultural competence of, or increasing access to teaching for, underserved populations are particularly valued. This may be demonstrated by positive evaluations from students, residents, fellows, local colleagues, and national peers. While the primary focus of teaching evaluations should be on classroom presentations, other forms of educational contributions are also recognized. These may include evaluations related to presentations delivered either internally or at other academic institutions,

presentations or tutorials at scientific conferences or meetings, presentations at other medical centers or hospitals, and similar contributions. Teaching awards and other honors, although not mandatory, are supportive of a strong teaching record. Peer evaluation is mandated on a recurring basis for all faculty members (refer to the Dossier documentation section). Candidates should consistently demonstrate effective teaching of trainees, researchers, and/or practitioners.

Mentorship of junior faculty is a requirement for those being considered for the rank of professor. It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, as opposed to ad hoc career coaching. Candidates must furnish evidence of mentoring or other career development activities for other faculty members. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards, among other mentoring programs, is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

Scholarship

Demonstration of a sustained and expanded impact and national reputation for the scholarship is a prerequisite for promotion to professor. The dossier will require the demonstration of impact, not just the potential for impact. The candidate must demonstrate a scholarship and a clear track record of leadership in collaborative health science. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued. For team scientists, independence and key scientific contributions are typically demonstrated by the establishment of interdisciplinary efforts in a focus area of basic, clinical, or translational science. First and senior-author papers are considered highly, but other authorship positions (e.g., second, third, second to last) on collaborative papers are often reflective of substantial research contributions where the candidate played an essential role in designing the study, linking, and manipulating data sources, analyzing the data, disseminating study results. In disciplines where the last author is reserved for the senior author, this role often reflects expertise and leadership in conceptualizing and guiding the study. However, because interdisciplinary publications often feature a large number of authors, the candidate who played a crucial role in supporting the research may appear virtually anywhere in the author list. While authorship positions and contributions will vary, candidates should clearly articulate and demonstrate their independent research contributions and the impact of those contributions. Evidence from other domains that demonstrate the faculty member's unique expertise at the national and/or international level (e.g., invitations to serve on study sections, invitations to speak at national meetings, etc.) is critical in this regard. In general, a range of 25-40 peer-reviewed publications since appointment to an associate professor is expected. Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles. Books, book chapters, and reviews are valued, but alone or in the majority will not be sufficient for promotion. In instances where a faculty member's application contains fewer peer-reviewed publications, some of them should be highly impactful and published in highly respected journals.

Faculty on this pathway are expected to have acquired external funding (as PI, MPI, Co-I, or key scientific leadership role) in support of their program of scholarship. This funding may be obtained from federal agencies, national foundations, or industry and private sector sponsors, provided it is competitive, peer-reviewed (or equivalently evaluated), and the candidate plays a substantial scientific or leadership role. The candidate should have a record of support as the lead personnel in their focus area (e.g., biostatistics, bioinformatics, informatics) on a substantial number of externally and/or internally funded grants, programs, contracts, and/or projects. The impact of the role that the faculty has on these studies should be clearly demonstrated, taking into consideration both the quality and quantity of the candidate's contributions. High-quality

contributions to grant proposals are also important for highly collaborative team scientists. In such cases, evidence provided by positive feedback from study section reviewers and supporting letters from collaborators can attest to the quality of the contribution. Entrepreneurship and inventorship are also considered evidence of scholarly activity.

Service

Promotion to the rank of professor requires service to the University and in a national context. The faculty member should have increased levels of responsibility and leadership (e.g., committee chair or elected office in national or international organizations) since appointment or promotion to associate professor. Candidates may have led the development of new and innovative programs that received national recognition. Similarly, innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as the design and implementation of a novel program can be considered service activities. Professional service could include, but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, service on editorial boards, and leadership positions in professional societies.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor

Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research. Promotion to associate professor requires documentation of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship based upon their expertise. Candidates typically should have 20-25 peer-reviewed journal publications since their appointment as research assistant professors. First, senior or corresponding authorships are typically not expected. Overall, the number of publications required for promotion should be sufficient to persuasively characterize the faculty member's influence in helping to discover new knowledge in their field. Thus, both quality and quantity are important considerations. It should be appreciated that a scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive promotion decision. Similarly, records of the scholarship below the specified range do not preclude a positive promotion decision.

It is expected that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of 100% salary recovery from extramural sources. Extramural support may include funding from federal agencies, national foundations, or industry or private sector sponsors, provided the funding is peer-reviewed or competitively awarded. Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators, and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigators) is not required. Documented contributions to obtaining or maintaining competitive funding, regardless of source, should clearly demonstrate the candidate's scientific expertise and value within the research team.

Promotion to Research Professor

Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research. Promotion to professor requires documentation evidence of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship. Candidates should have 25-35 peer-reviewed journal publications since their appointment as research associate professors. Some first, senior, or corresponding authorships are expected. Overall, the number of publications required for promotion should be sufficient to persuasively characterize the faculty member's influence in helping to discover new knowledge in their field. In instances where a research faculty member's application contains fewer peer-reviewed publications, some of them should be highly impactful and published in highly respected journals. Thus, both quality and quantity are important considerations. It should be appreciated that a scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive

promotion decision. Similarly, records of the scholarship below the specified range do not preclude a positive promotion decision.

It is expected that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of 100% salary recovery from extramural sources. Such extramural support may come from federal agencies, national foundations, or industry or private sector sponsors. Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators, and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigators) is not required. However, the candidate must clearly document their substantive contributions to obtaining or maintaining competitive research funding, regardless of source. Evidence may include their scientific leadership, methodological expertise, or other critical roles that support the sustainability and success of the research program.