Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Cancer Biology and Genetics

Approved by the Faculty: 9/23/2024

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 10/28/2025

Table of Contents

I. **Preamble** 3
II. **Department Mission** 3
III. **Definitions** 4
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty 4
1 Tenure-track Faculty 4
2 Clinical Faculty 4
3 Research Faculty 5
4 Associated Faculty 5
5 Conflict of Interest 6
6 Minimum Composition 6
B. Quorum 7
C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 7
1 Appointment 7
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion 7
IV. **Appointments** 7
A. Criteria 7
1 Tenure-Track Faculty 8
2 Clinical Faculty 10
3 Research Faculty 11
4 Associated Faculty 12
5 Emeritus Faculty 14
6 Joint Appointments 14
7 Courtesy Appointments 14
B. Procedures 14
1 Tenure-Track Faculty 15
2 Clinical Faculty 16
3 Research Faculty 16
4 Transfer from the Tenure-Track 16
5 TIU Transfer 17
6 Associated Faculty 17
7 Joint Appointments 18
8 Courtesy Appointments 18
V. **Annual Performance and Merit Review** 18
A. Documentation 19
B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty 19
1 Fourth Year Review 20
2 Extension of the Tenure Clock 20
3 Termination of Probationary Appointments 20
C. Tenured Faculty 21
D. Clinical Faculty 21
E. Research Faculty 22
F. Associated Faculty 22
G. Salary Recommendations 23
VI **Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews** 23
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion 24
1 Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure 24
2 Promotion to Professor 28
3 Promotion of Clinical Faculty 30
4 Promotion of Research Faculty 32
5 Associated Faculty 32
B. Procedures 33
1 Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty 33
a. Candidate Responsibilities 33
b Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities 35
c Department Chair Responsibilities 36

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty....37
3 External Evaluation Letters....38
VII. **Appeals of Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Decisions** 39
VIII. **Seventh Year Rev**iew....40
IX. **Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching**....40
A Student Evaluation of Teaching....40
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching....40

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure; Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Clinical Faculty and Research Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Non-reappointment, and Promotion, respectively), the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, the policies established by the College of Medicine; and other policies and procedures of the university to which the department and its faculty are subject. Should those rules and policies change, the Department shall follow the new rules and policies and update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least once every four years on appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

The Dean of the College and the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University must approve this document 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 its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Dean and Executive Vice President and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The Faculty and the Administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to the Department and College; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the University's policy on equal employment opportunity.

II. Department Mission

The mission of the Department of Cancer Biology and Genetics is: to conduct research in basic, translational or applied cancer biology and genetics in order to understand mechanisms of disease initiation and progression, as well as the mechanisms involved in the control of disease processes; to train undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate and professional students in the disciplines of cancer biology and genetics; and to provide service for the general benefit of the life science community within the College of Medicine (COM) and The Ohio State University, as well as at the local, state and national levels.

The research mission of the Department is for faculty to engage in basic, translational, or applied research that will generate new knowledge pertinent to their professional discipline. Faculty will be responsible for the funding of their research programs through grant support, patent royalties or other mechanisms, and will disseminate knowledge acquired from their research through timely publication and other scholarly endeavors. An important part of the research mission of the Department is the instruction of undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate, and professional students in the conduct and methodology of research.

The educational mission of the Department is to strive for excellence in the didactic teaching of basic and applied aspects of cancer biology and genetics to undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. The graduate education mission encompasses research training of Masters and Ph.D. students, i.e., providing experienced mentors, state-of-the-art laboratory facilities and curricula to prepare students for careers in contemporary cancer biology, genetics and other related fields. The Department provides education and training for medical and graduate students in interdisciplinary graduate programs, including Biochemistry Graduate Program (OSBP), the Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program (BSGP), the Medical Scientist Training Program (MSTP), Neuroscience Graduate Program (NGSP), Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology Graduate Program (MCDB), and Biophysics Graduate Program.

The service mission of the Department is to provide professional service through dissemination of knowledge or administrative contributions to the biomedical community at OSU and to the citizens of Ohio. Professional service also involves service rendered to national agencies in the areas of grant reviewing, journal reviewing, and service to professional societies. Administrative service involves active faculty participation in the governance of the Department, College and/or University.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

The department Chair, the Dean and Assistant and Associate Deans of the college, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring) review of an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor the eligible faculty consists of all faculty (tenure-track, research and clinical) with 50% or greater appointment in the department.

Rank Reviews

- A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of Assistant Professors and the tenure reviews of untenured Associate 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

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an Assistant Clinical Professor, an Associate Clinical Professor, or a Clinical Professor, the eligible faculty consists of all faculty (tenure-track, research and clinical) with 50% or greater appointment in the department.

- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary clinical faculty with 50% or greater appointment of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of Assistant Clinical Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors, all nonprobationary Associate Clinical Professors and all nonprobationary Clinical Professors with 50% or greater appointment.

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of Associate Clinical Professors and the reappointment reviews of Clinical Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Professors and all nonprobationary Clinical Professors with 50% or greater appointment.

3 Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a Research Assistant Professor, a Research Associate Professor, or a Research Professor, the eligible faculty consists of all faculty (tenure-track, research and clinical) with 50% or greater appointment in the department.

- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested with 50% or greater appointment in the department.

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 with 50% or greater appointment in the department.

- 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 with 50% or greater appointment in the department.

4 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of associated faculty members is decided by the department Chair upon recommendation from the search advisory committee. Reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the department Chair in consultation with the Committee of Eligible Faculty. Initial appointments at senior rank in the department require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary clinical and research faculty and all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) with 50% or greater appointment in the department and prior approval of the college dean.

Promotion Reviews

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

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

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

- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department Chair in consultation with the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

5 Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists for faculty on search committees and as member of the eligible faculty in the following circumstances:

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- has substantive financial ties with the candidate;
- is dependent in some way on the candidate's services;
- has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

6 Minimum Composition

In the event that the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the Dean, will appoint a faculty member from another

department within the College.

B. 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 on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

1 Appointment

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast is positive.

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

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

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

IV. Appointments

A Criteria

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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment.

All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1 Tenure-Track Faculty

Instructor. The Department follows the guidelines for appointments and reappointments at the rank of Instructor provided in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (B) (1). Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of Assistant Professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to Assistant Professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to Assistant Professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to Assistant Professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department Chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit, unless an extension of the probationary period has been requested by the faculty member and approved in accordance with University rules. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

An appointee at the Assistant Professor level normally will have a Ph.D. and a strong post-doctoral experience. Candidates for appointment at this rank will be expected to have demonstrated an initial level of accomplishment in the establishment of a research career. This will be reflected by the achievement of journal publications and presentation of papers at recognized scientific societies. Previous or current research support will be highly desirable.

Positions at the level of Assistant Professor are offered to faculty candidates who either have no prior faculty experience, or who have an academic appointment elsewhere but have not yet received tenure. These positions will be filled after a national, competitive search in an appropriate research area that is consistent with the mission of the Department. Criteria for these positions include (1) demonstrated research productivity as reflected in peer-reviewed papers published in peer-reviewed journals; (2) demonstrated ability to secure extramural grant support, or clear evidence for the likely prospects of same; and (3) evidence of potential excellence in teaching and (4) a mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement of Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors.

An Assistant Professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an Assistant Professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 of the Administrative Code and the provisions of paragraphs (F), (G), and (H) of 3335-6-03. If tenure is not granted, a one-year terminal year of employment is offered. See below Article

V on Annual Performance and Merit Review and Article VI on Promotion and Tenure Reviews for more.

Associate Professor or Professor. The criteria for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in the Department will be consistent with those for promotion to these ranks as defined later in this document regarding criteria for promotion and tenure. All appointments to the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure, or Professor with tenure require prior approval of the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Positions at the level of Associate Professor are offered to those who have either satisfied the criteria below for tenure while appointed at the Assistant Professor level, or who have been recruited by a national, competitive search and have successfully obtained tenure at a peer institution with equivalent rigorous standards for promotion and tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of Associate Professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. In addition, new recruits who received tenure at an institution that does not have standards comparable to the Department may be appointed at the Associate level without tenure with approval by the Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. For the petition to be approved a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at Associate Professor is appropriate but tenure is not. Care in making these appointments will be exercised, especially if the probationary period will be less than four years. Requests for such appointments will be submitted for approval by the Dean of the College of Medicine, and the Executive Vice President and Provost. In the Department, the length of probationary service for Associate Professors or higher will be reviewed by the Department committee of the eligible faculty with a recommendation provided to the Chair. Review for tenure will occur in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Under circumstances of demonstrated ability, a position at the level of Associate Professor with tenure may be filled by an individual recruited from elsewhere, who has not received academic tenure at the previous institution. The major criterion for evaluation of the candidate's research program is that the candidate has built a robust and independent research program that has national impact in the field of Cancer Biology and Genetics as indicated by: (1) a body of publications in relevant peer-reviewed journals; (2) impact of the independent scholarship as measured by journal impact factors and Eigen factors, citations indexes, the candidates H-factor, and other similar metrics; (3) demonstrated ability to obtain and sustain competitive grant support at the national level (typically, this grant support will come from the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation or other national granting agency having a recognized peer-review process for making awards); demonstrated success in training graduate students and post-doctoral scholars; and other evidence of a nationally recognized research program (e.g., invitations to speak at national and international scientific meetings, seminar invitations, invitations to review manuscripts and grants, invited review articles, etc.).

The same rules as those for the Assistant Professor (see above) regarding promotion, tenure, termination and notification of termination apply to non-tenured Associate Professors during their probationary period.

Positions at the level of Professor are offered to those who have either satisfied the criteria below for promotion to Professor, or who have been recruited by a national, competitive search and have met the criteria. Briefly, criteria for appointment at the rank of Professor include performance in the areas of research, teaching and service. The candidate should have achieved a level of international impact and evidence for national/international leadership. Examples of leadership included invited presentations at

prestigious national and international meetings, elected office in national and international research organizations, chairing NIH or other major study sections, service as editor for scientific journals or on the editorial board of the most prestigious journals and invited reviews in high impact journals. External letters will be sought for evaluation of the candidate's research effort addressing these specific points. Teaching will be evaluated by peer and student reviews, and teaching awards received. Service will be evaluated on the basis of the candidate's documented participation in significant Department, College and University committees and at the national or international level in the organization of scientific meetings, peer-review of grant applications or service on the editorial boards of scientific journals.

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

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

2 Clinical Faculty

The Department of Cancer Biology and Genetics supports clinical faculty only on the Clinician Educator pathway. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus primarily on excellence as educators as measured by teaching evaluations, innovative teaching practices and curricular development, and publications. Faculty are expected to contribute to the Department's research and education missions, as reflected by participation in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. While Clinical Faculty may serve as the PI on a grant proposal, securing extramural funding as a PI is not expected. However, participation as Co-I or collaborator in extramural funding opportunities may be expected of some Clinical faculty per their letter of offer. Clinical appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7.

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

Contracts for clinical faculty members must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, it is expected that clinical faculty appointees will provide significant salary support drawn from service line activities and teaching responsibilities. It is expected that salary support will be derived from a combination of extramural funds, service line activities, teaching revenue and other sources.

Clinical faculty members are eligible to serve on University committees and task forces but not on University governance committees. Clinical faculty members also are eligible to advise and supervise graduate and postdoctoral students and be a Principal Investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the Graduate School as detailed in the Graduate School Handbook.

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

Assistant Clinical Professor. Candidates for appointment as an Assistant Clinical Professor on the

Clinician Educator pathway must provide clear and convincing evidence of the following criteria: An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, relevant educational experience, and demonstration of strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks. They are expected to be primarily engaged in teaching and educational service while making contributions to scholarship and academic service.

Associate Clinical Professor. Candidates for appointment as an Associate Clinical Professor on the Clinician Educator pathway must meet all the criteria for Assistant Clinical Professors and demonstrate clear and convincing evidence of a record of national impact and recognition in teaching, scholarship and service in their area of expertise. This may include national impact and recognition in teaching in the biomedical sciences in general or specific expertise in cancer biology and genetics. Candidates may also show excellence in education through leadership of or development of an academic program such as master's or PhD level program that attracts students nationally.

Clinical Professor. Candidates for appointment as a Clinical Professor on the Clinician Educator pathway must meet all the criteria for an Associate Clinical Professor and demonstrate clear and convincing evidence of a record of international impact and recognition in teaching, scholarship and service in their area of expertise. This may include international impact and recognition in teaching in the biomedical sciences in general or specific expertise in cancer biology and genetics. Candidates may also show excellence in education through membership of national education committees or leading educational committees for professional societies.

3 Research Faculty

Research faculty appointments are fixed term (one to five years) contract appointments that do not entail tenure. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the Department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7-30.

The goals of such appointments are career advancement of qualified individuals in research core facilities or in the research groups of the Department's tenured faculty (the Sponsor). These appointments may provide the opportunity for individuals to develop their own independent research programs, including specifically the ability to obtain independent grants.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor may be offered to individuals of exceptional research promise, who typically will be long standing members in the research groups of the tenure-track faculty in the Department. Criteria for these positions include 1) an earned doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, 2) completion of sufficient post-doctoral research training to provide a basis for establishment of an independent research program, 3) demonstrated research productivity as reflected in papers published in high-quality peer-reviewed journals, and 4) demonstrated ability to secure extramural grant support, or clear evidence for the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor requires the candidate to have met the criteria listed above for Research Assistant Professor and established an independent program of research over a period of at least six years. While the individual may continue to collaborate with their tenure-track sponsor, it is expected that the individual will have published a significant body of work independently of the Sponsor. Criteria for evaluation of the candidate's research program includes 1) publications in the principal peer reviewed journals in the field of genetics and cancer

biology, 2) demonstrated ability to obtain and sustain extramural grant support (typically, this grant support will come from federal grant agencies having a recognized peer review process for making awards); and 3) other evidence of a nationally/internationally recognized research program (e.g., invitations to speak at national and international scientific meetings, etc., as listed above for the tenure-track faculty).

Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Professor requires the candidate to have met the criteria listed above for Research Associate Professor and the candidate must include demonstration of an independent, internationally recognized research program. Evaluation of the research program includes each of the criteria for the Research Associate Professor level, with the additional expectation that the research program has achieved a level of international prominence. Prominence will be judged, for example by invited presentations at prestigious national international meetings, invited reviews in high impact biochemical journals and similar indicators listed above.

The primary duty of research faculty is to conduct research. They are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected in high quality peer-reviewed publications; independent publications and independent grant support are expected. Research faculty may, but are not required to, participate in the educational mission of the Department. However, teaching opportunities for each research faculty member must be approved by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty. Under no circumstances may a member of the research faculty be continuously engaged over an extended period in the same instructional activities as tenure-track faculty.

Research faculty will be eligible to advise and supervise graduate and postdoctoral students and to be a principal investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the graduate program in which the student is enrolled and the Graduate School as set forth in rule 3335-5-29 and detailed in the Graduate School Handbook.

Per University Faculty Rules, for research faculty it is generally expected that salary recovery/support will be derived 100% from non-departmental funds with the majority from external funding sources. While salary support for research faculty may not come from dollars provided to the department from the college, the department may choose to provide funding from individual departmental faculty research funds, start-up funds, and/or department Chair package funds to maintain the faculty member's salary at 100%. The Principal Investigator must certify to the Department Chair that sufficient research funds exist to cover the salary over the period of the contract. Research faculty will not be assigned independent research space but will work in specifically designated space assigned to a tenure-track faculty member in the Department. Space designation will be made in writing, in the form of a letter from the Principal Investigator or tenure-track faculty member to the Department Chair. Space made available will be consistent the Center or College Space Policy, which depends on extramural funding. Research faculty are expected to adhere to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors.

While continued collaboration with the original Principal Investigator is likely, a research faculty member is expected to begin to publish a body of work independent and as the Principal Investigator. Peer-reviewed publications independent of the original Principal Investigator and independent grant support are expected within three years of appointment. These expectations are consistent with the career development goals of the research in the Department.

4 Associated Faculty

Associated Faculty as defined in Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (C) are persons with adjunct titles, clinical titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles; also Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors

who serve on appointments totaling less than 50% service to the University. Persons with tenured faculty titles may not hold Associated titles. Persons holding Associated titles are not eligible for tenure. Associated faculty appointments are made for the period in which the service is provided and 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: Instructor, Assistant/Associate Professor, Professor. The titles of Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, and Adjunct Instructor shall be used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty of equivalent rank. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated service to the instructional and/or research programs of the Department and who require a faculty title to perform that service (Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (B). Examples of such service would include serving on graduate committees or serving as a co-investigator on a research project. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track, clinical or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Visiting: Instructor, Assistant/Associate Professor, Professor. The titles of Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, and Visiting Instructor shall be used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to faculty of equivalent rank who spend a limited period of time on formal appointment while in residence at this institution for the purpose of participating in the instructional and research programs of the Department. A visiting appointment cannot exceed three continuous academic years of service. [Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (C) (3)]. The appointments can be made for only one-year at a time.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. The titles of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer shall be used for all compensated instructional appointments where other titles are not appropriate. Lecturers may engage in the full range of teaching activities as defined under Faculty Rule 3335-6-06 (A)(2).

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

Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have: 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 cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Tenure-Track Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of associated faculty with 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. It is expected that faculty will support 50% or more of their FTE appointment in the Department with extramural funds. Partial-appointment faculty are expected to contribute to the department by participating in department faculty meetings, committees (except Committee of Eligible faculty) and

faculty recruitment.

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.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department Chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department Chair, who will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. Should the chair deny the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, 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 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

7 Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointees (those having joint appointments with no salary) are faculty members from another unit at Ohio State who make important contributions to the Department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. Faculty with courtesy appointments will be invited to faculty meetings and may be eligible to vote on some issues but excluding Department Patterns of Administration, Workload Policy and personnel issues. These faculty members may also vote on matters when serving on *ad hoc* departmental committees. Courtesy appointments will be reviewed every three years by the Chair. Courtesy appointments are made at the individuals' current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is 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.

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 senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

1 Tenure-Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a 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 Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

The appointment of tenure-track positions must be based on a clear and sound plan for the programmatic future of the Department and College and on a realistic determination of the availability of resources to support the appointment. The Dean of the College provides approval for the Department to commence a faculty search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

A Search Advisory Committee consisting of five or more faculty will be appointed by the Chair. The majority of the Search Advisory Committee should be composed of faculty members from the Department of Cancer Biology and Genetics.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the 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 and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- "Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment" is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified 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 CBG chair recommending candidates for interviews.
- "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.

Following completion of virtual/on-campus interviews, a formal vote of the eligible faculty is required for all appointments with a simple majority in favor indicating consensus support for appointment. The Chair will make an independent evaluation of the candidate and negotiate the terms of appointment along with any centers or institutes providing financial support. The Chair will then send a letter indicating the Department's recommendation to the Dean.

All offers at the level of Associate Professor with or without tenure, and Professor require full review by the eligible faculty for that particular review, which will make a specific recommendation about the appropriateness of the proposed rank to the Chair. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the Committee of Eligible Faculty also votes on the appropriateness of such credit. The Office of Academic Affairs must approve appointments at senior rank, including any offers of prior service credit. The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

During a probationary period, a faculty member who does not have tenure is considered for reappointment annually. At the time of appointment, the Department Chair shall provide the probationary faculty member with a copy of the Department Promotion & Tenure guidelines. It is the responsibility of the Chair to review with the faculty member the process for promotion and tenure in the Department. At the time of appointment, the overall research objectives as well as the teaching assignments for the appointee in the professional and graduate programs in the College, will be defined.

2 Clinical Faculty

The same procedures described above for tenure-track faculty are followed for clinical faculty. The candidate's presentation during the interview is based on teaching rather than scholarship.

3 Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that candidates are not expected to teach. Exceptions to the national search requirement for internal candidates (e.g., research scientists) being hired into a research faculty position must be approved by the university OAA using Form 211 (Search Waiver Request).

4 Transfer from the Tenure-Track

Transfers from a research or clinical appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. However, research and clinical faculty may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in national searches for such positions, as described in this document.

The Department allows for the possibility of transfer from the tenure-track faculty to a research or clinical appointment under appropriate circumstances. Such a transfer requires the following: (i) The request for transfer must be initiated by a tenure-track faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. (ii) When a tenured faculty member transfers to a research or clinical appointment, tenure is relinquished. (iii) The Department Chair, the College Dean, the Executive Vice President and Provost must approve all transfers.

5 TIU Transfer

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

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

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

6 Associated Faculty

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is decided by the Department Chair based on recommendation from the search committee. Advanced titles (e.g. Sr. Lecturers) require a rank review from the Committee of Eligible Faculty and the approval of the dean.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the Department Chair after consultation with the Eligible Faculty.

Compensated appointments are made on an annual basis, for periods from one to three years and entail no commitment to renew the appointment beyond that period.

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

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Eligible Faculty.

An appointment at no-salary is warranted only if there is substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department.

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

7 Joint Appointments

A TIU may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

8 Courtesy Appointments

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

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment, which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

The Department Chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the Chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit *[e.g. more than 50 probationary faculty]*, the Department Chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary

faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair or the Chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

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

The Department Chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-35) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein to include in the file.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, all compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department Chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes:

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

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document and typically includes reprints of published articles, course evaluations from students and listing of editorial boards, study sections, ad hoc journal reviewers, etc. The time period covered by this documentation is the previous 12 months. Additional details on documentation of performance are provided in Section VI.

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

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

On an annual basis, the probationary faculty member will provide to the Chair the documentation listed above along with a description of plans for the next year. In addition to documentation of achievements, a candidate may also include any information documenting why it was not possible to achieve objectives and whether commitments made by the Department, College or University were not fulfilled as promised. The Department Chair, and, at the discretion of the Chair or faculty member being reviewed, the Vice Chair or another party such as the Departmental Administrator, will also be included in the meeting with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The Chair prepares a letter of evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. If the Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this

recommendation is final. The 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. A copy of this letter (along with the faulty member's comments, if received) is retained in the candidate's file and sent to the Dean of The College of Medicine.

In the event that the Chair believes that non-renewal of a probationary appointment may be appropriate, fourth year review procedures (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) must be followed, as described below. If the Chair recommends non-renewal following faculty review (regardless of the faculty recommendation), the case is sent to the Dean for College level review. The Dean makes the final decision in the matter.

1 Fourth Year Review

The process for the Fourth Year Review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review except external evaluations are optional, and the Dean, not the Department Chair, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. The Department Chair and the Committee of Eligible Faculty will separately review the candidate's dossier and the annual reviews from the three preceding years.

External evaluations are solicited only when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that 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 do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the Department Chair. The Department Chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the departmental review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 B.5) is followed, and the case is forwarded to the College for review, regardless of whether the Department Chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

Appointment to the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the College of Medicine. Before reaching a negative decision, or a decision contrary to that expressed in the letter from the Department Chair, the Dean will consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee before a final decision is reached.

2 Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

3 Termination of Probationary Appointments

Probationary appointments may be terminated during any probationary year due to inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time, other than the Fourth Year Review or mandatory review for tenure, a nonrenewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with Fourth Year Review procedures described above. Notification of nonrenewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in Rule 3335-6-08 of the Administrative Code.

Per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 probationary appointments may be terminated for fiscal or programmatic reasons.

When nonrenewal is based on fiscal or programmatic reasons, the faculty member should be advised that such nonrenewal is a possibility and formal notice of nonrenewal should be provided as soon as possible after the need for nonrenewal is established. Nonrenewal of a probationary appointment for fiscal or programmatic reasons does not entail a performance review and requires the prior approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Because hiring decisions should be based on informed assumptions regarding the future availability of resources and of programmatic needs, approval of such non-renewals will be based on the extent to which convincing evidence is provided that the fiscal or programmatic reasons for the nonrenewal could not be anticipated when the appointment was made and are expected to be long lasting.

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

C. Tenured Faculty

On an annual basis, every tenured faculty member will provide the Chair and Vice Chair with the documentation listed above. The Chair, and, at the discretion of the Chair or faculty member being reviewed, the Vice Chair or another party such as the Departmental Administrator, will also meet with all tenured faculty members to discuss performance and future goals and will subsequently provide the faculty member with a written evaluation of their performance. A separate letter will contain an explanation documenting recommendations for salary for the next year. It is expected that one outcome of this evaluation process will be constructive feedback concerning professional development of each faculty member. This will include (but not be limited to) constructive suggestions related to: (1) development of grant applications; (2) submission of manuscripts and appropriate response to reviewers' criticisms; (3) development of teaching skills; (4) involvement in service at the national level (including service on federal grant review panels, journal editorial boards and national/international meetings); and (5) service within the University (both administratively and with regard to the several graduate programs relevant to the Department's mission, including service on thesis committees). The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

The annual review of Professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the 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 Clinical Faculty

In the first term, clinical appointments at all levels in the Department are probationary, with annual reviews to be conducted by the Department Chair. In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty member's probationary appointment, the Committee of Eligible Faculty will perform a full performance review with a specific recommendation based on a majority vote of eligible faculty being made to the Chair as to whether the appointment should be extended, and a new contract offered. The reappointment review during the penultimate contract year proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are

not solicited. The Chair will conduct an independent review. The Chair will inform the clinical faculty member whether the appointment will be renewed for another term. In all cases, 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.

If the appointment 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.

During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, clinical faculty appointments may be terminated for not meeting the terms of the contract (e.g., failure to financially support their position by teaching, service and/or external funding). Appointments may also be terminated during a contract period for cause (see Rule 3335-5-04 of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see Rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code). Termination decisions for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by Faculty Rules. In addition, a contract may be renegotiated during a contract period, but only with the voluntary consent of the clinical faculty member.

E Research Faculty

In the first term, research appointments at all levels in the Department are probationary, with annual reviews to be conducted by the Department Chair. In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's probationary appointment, the Committee of Eligible Faculty will perform a full performance review with a specific recommendation based on a majority vote of eligible faculty being made to the Chair as to whether the appointment should be extended, and a new contract offered. The reappointment review during the penultimate contract year proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The Chair will conduct an independent review. The Chair will inform the research faculty member whether the appointment will be renewed for another term. Subsequent appointment will be for one to five years. In all cases, 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. If the appointment 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. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract.

During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, Research Faculty appointments may be terminated for not meeting the terms of the contract (e.g. failure to obtain extramural support). Appointments may also be terminated during a contract period for cause (see Rule 3335-5-04 of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see Rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code). Termination decisions for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by Faculty Rules. The standards of notice set forth in Rule 3335-6-08 of the Administrative Code apply to Research Faculty appointments. In addition, a contract may be renegotiated during a contract period, but only with the voluntary consent of the Research Faculty member.

F. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department Chair will prepare a written evaluation and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals.

Following consultation with the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the Chair decides upon renewal of the appointment. The Chair's decision on the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the Chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department Chair, or designee, who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, following

consultation with the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the department Chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The Chair's decision on reappointment is final.

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.

The quality of teaching, scholarship and service, as established during the annual review, will all be taken into account in assessing performance for purposes of merit salary increases each year. The quality of teaching will be judged by student evaluations of formal coursework, by written peer evaluation of teaching in formal coursework, and. by chairing and membership on PhD and MS graduate committees. Scholarship will be judged in terms of extramural research funding and publication in high impact peer- reviewed journals. Service shall include committee work at the Department, College and University level and service to local, national and international professional organizations. Because the assignments and duties of individual faculty members differ, the relative weight given to accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service will vary. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more core areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

In formulating recommendations, the department Chair consults with Departmental Administrator and Vice-Chair(s). The time frame for assessing performance will be based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Special accomplishments in a given academic year will have a favorable impact on recommended salary increases. These would include formal recognition for outstanding teaching or research, new extramural research funding, election to high office in a national or international scientific organization, assuming the editorship of a major scientific journal, etc.

Merit increases will be denied to faculty who submit documentation insufficient to permit an informed evaluation of their performance and who fail to rectify this deficiency within 10 calendar days of having been informed in writing by the Chair that documentation is inadequate. Likewise, faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time

Consideration will also be given to the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall record and to the salaries of other individuals within the Department with comparable overall records. The Department Chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary equity excellence pay raises will be considered in raise recommendations, but they are separate from merit salary increases.

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

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating a candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where required, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the University enters new areas of endeavor, including

the establishment of research centers and institutes, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases, care will be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances, superior intellectual attainment is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions.

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's Shared Values; adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations. Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to varied ideas and opinions.

1 Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a scholar, teacher, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality scholarship, teaching, and service relevant to the mission of the Department and to the University. Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

The Department of Cancer Biology and Genetics shall exercise very high standards for the award of tenure since a positive tenure decision has a powerful impact on the quality and future of the Department. Although criteria will vary according to the particular responsibilities of each faculty member, every candidate shall be held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Faculty members are evaluated on the totality of their performance in all areas of responsibility (research, teaching and service) with emphasis on their primary area(s) of responsibility. Mediocre performance in the primary area of performance (e.g. research) cannot be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in other areas. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

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.

The content below is not meant to be exhaustive or applicable to all disciplines but is provided to demonstrate the types of criteria and evidence that may support promotion to associate professor with tenure.

Criterion: Research/Scholarship. Demonstration of national recognition and impact for a coherent and thematic independent program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to Associate Professor and the award of tenure. Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge.

Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in the field of genetics and/or cancer biology. As laid out in the College of Medicine AP&T Document, there are multiple metrics available for judging the excellence and impact of scholarship, and the full range of available criteria should be considered in evaluating the candidate's program. Quality and innovation will be considered more important than sheer quantity or strict adherence to traditional scope. Publication in peer-reviewed, high impact factor or Eigenfactor journals as corresponding author is mandatory. Funding from NIH or an equivalent Federal Agency (for example NSF) as a Principal Investigator (to include the Multiple Principal Investigator mechanism) is mandatory for promotion. Additional established indicators of a national reputation are a mandatory requirement for promotion and tenure. Above all, promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires excellence and demonstration of significant impact in research. Impact is the single most important criterion for promotion and is determined primarily by high quality research; however, quantity is also an important metric to be considered.

Evidence: Research/Scholarship. There are several forms of evidence that candidates can provide that will be considered by the AP&T committee as evidence of having scientific impact: (a) Publication as first or senior author in the field's highest impact factor journals, (b) the Eigen factor score of the journals in which the candidate publishes, (c) citation rates (the number of times a paper has been cited by other publications), (d) the candidate's h- index, (e) invitations to speak at national and international meetings and for seminars at other institutions, (f) appointment to editorial boards, (g) invitations to write review articles, participation on steering, guideline, or advisory committees of national organizations, invitations to serve on grant review panels, (j) receipt of national scientific awards, and recognition of impact from outside evaluators.

Successful promotion will require the demonstration of impact, not just the potential for impact. 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; book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion. The candidate's citation rate will be documented and verified by the Procedure Oversight Designee (POD); the dossier will contain a citation table that indicates the number of citations for individual papers published at The Ohio State University, as well as an overall career citation index. It is recognized that the citation rate for papers published within 1 or 2 years before review for Promotion and Tenure is initiated may be low due to the short time the work has been available. However, evidence that the work is well received would be supportive of the impact of the work and would commonly be documented in outside expert letters of evaluation (see below). Considered together, demonstration of impact and a national reputation of an independent program of research is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure.

Criterion: Publications. Publications represent the archival results of the faculty member's research program both before and since their appointment in the Department, and they play a critical role in evaluations for promotion and tenure. If a former mentor is retained as an author on the candidate's papers beyond the first year of faculty appointment, the reason must be clearly stated because it could suggest that the candidate has failed to develop an independent scientific career. It is expected that faculty members will publish consistently. The primary metric for evaluating publication records will be to determine whether the faculty member has established a consistent pattern of high-quality publications resulting from work primarily conducted independently in the candidate's laboratory. For example, candidates demonstrating publications as corresponding author in the principal peer-reviewed, rigorous journals would be considered suitable for meeting the criteria. It is also expected that candidates will demonstrate that independent, publications as corresponding author constitute a substantial portion of the publication list. However, faculty members are encouraged to participate in collaborative multidisciplinary research, and it is expected that a faculty member's record of scholarship will include papers on which they are secondary author. High impact publications in

which faculty members have participated as a member of a broader team-based approach to manuscript development and publication will also be recognized as evidence of scholarship especially when candidates demonstrate that specific roles in team scholarship reflect unique intellectual and/or leadership contributions.

Evidence: Publications. For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the successful candidates should publish on average one to two peer-reviewed publications as senior or co-corresponding author and at one to two collaborative publications per year, although it is acceptable to be below this level of productivity in the early years of the appointment. The total number will thus depend on the years in rank. While these ranges are intended as general guidelines, the scientific value and/or impact factor of the research publications is considered of greater importance than the absolute number. A faculty member is expected to be on a trajectory to exceed these publication requirements at the time of promotion. However, productivity that exceeds these guidelines does not guarantee a positive promotion and tenure recommendation if the research is not judged to be of acceptable quality or impact; thus, it is not advisable to publish the smallest quanta of data to enhance publication numbers. It is also possible that productivity below these ranges could result in a positive promotion and tenure review if candidates demonstrate strong impact for his/her/their independent research (see above for guidelines for demonstrating impact). Finally, because junior faculty who are just initiating their careers may not have a sufficient number of employees, students and postdoctoral fellows in their laboratories to assist in conducting experiments, they are encouraged to engage with colleagues in collaborations. Assistant Professors with substantial teaching or service obligations greater than departmental norms may also publish fewer senior author manuscripts than typical. Examples of these activities include being a course director of a large graduate course, directing a core facility, or organizing a large national meeting. In any case, emphasis should be on the quality of the work as recognized by their peers and as addressed by the external evaluators. 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 independent scholarly achievement while a faculty member at Ohio State University.

Overall, the number of publications required for awarding of promotion and tenure should be sufficient to document a faculty member's influence in discovery of new knowledge in their field and their ability to communicate their data effectively to the scientific community. Thus, quality and impact are the most important criteria for promotion, but quantity is also important.

Criterion: Demonstrated Ability to Obtain and Sustain Competitive Grant Support.

Evidence: Demonstrated Ability to Obtain and Sustain Competitive Grant Support. Funding as Principal Investigator (or Multi-Principal Investigator) from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or equivalent (e.g., National Science Foundation, NSF or Department of Defense, DOD) is a mandatory requirement for promotion. Additionally, the candidate should demonstrate capability to sustain funding, for example by competitive renewal of an NIH or equivalent grant or the award of a second major NIH or equivalent grant (e.g., NSF or DOD). Peer-reviewed funding from other national agencies or foundations (e.g. American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, etc.), or awards as co-Investigator on NIH or NSF grant, or funding from pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies are strongly encouraged and provide another strong indicator of national reputation but are not by themselves sufficient demonstration of the ability to obtain and sustain national support.

Criterion: National Reputation. Achievement of national reputation is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure.

Evidence: National Reputation. Indications that the faculty member has achieved national/international recognition may include invited addresses, election to national or local offices of scientific or learned societies, invitations to review grants, editorial assignments, conference participation and organizing (e.g.

chairing a symposium session), and invitations to contribute book chapters or reviews.

Criterion: Research Independence and Collaboration. It is recognized that research collaboration is important for attaining new knowledge and is encouraged.

Evidence: Research Independence and Collaboration Fruitful collaborations usually involve important and recognizable contributions from each of the collaborators. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is a highly valued component of the dossier that demonstrates a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship, and includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Individual input of the faculty member as a middle author may also be uniquely contributory and should be clearly communicated by the candidate. It is important for candidates to identify how the collaboration relates to the candidate's own research program.

Criterion: Demonstrated Success in Training GRA and PhD Scholars.

Evidence: Demonstrated Success in Training GRA and PhD Scholars Documented success in degree completion by trainees sponsored by the faculty member can also contribute to the teaching component of the dossier.

Criterion: Entrepreneurship as a Special Form of Scholarship.

Evidence: Entrepreneurship as a Special Form of Scholarship Entrepreneurship includes, but may not be limited to, invention disclosures, software development, materials transfers (e.g., novel plasmids, transgenic animals, cell lines, antibodies, and similar reagents), technology commercialization, patent and copyrights, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements. In as much as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, such contributions will be analyzed flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents considered equivalent to an original peer reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenues considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion and tenure dossier.

Faculty members in the Department of Cancer Biology and Genetics are primarily engaged in research, although excellence in teaching and service is required for promotion and tenure. See below.

Criterion: Teaching. For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- demonstrated regular didactic teaching as a course-instructor or lecturer;
- provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in each instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge;
- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction and enthusiasm;
- demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment;
- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity and appreciation of the knowledge creation process;
- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process;
- treated students with respect and courtesy;

- improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs;
- served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the Department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise;
- engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.

Evidence: Teaching. Faculty evaluation of teaching will consist of two parts: review of lecture notes, materials and handouts; and firsthand observation in the classroom. Faculty are responsible for inviting tenure-track or clinical faculty at a higher rank to provide peer-evaluation of their teaching. As needed, the Chair, in consultation with the Education and Training Committee and Chair of the Eligible Faculty, will appoint faculty members to evaluate the classroom presentations of Assistant and Associate Professors. It is the responsibility of the Chair to ascertain that evaluations are carried out on an annual basis. Faculty attending lectures are required to submit a written report in which they evaluate the content and style of presentation. Faculty will be evaluated in regard to the organization, presentation and level of material.

Criterion: Service. A candidate for promotion and tenure shall also be held to a high standard of service.

Evidence: Service. Service includes service to the College, University, scientific community, as well as to the Department. Community service that utilizes the professional expertise of the faculty member is also relevant. Exemplars of national service include service on editorial review boards of journals, service on study sections from national granting agencies, election to offices for professional societies, and organization of national meetings or symposia.

2 Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized internationally; and has demonstrated leadership at both the national and international level. The Department of Cancer Biology and Genetics expects an individual ready for promotion to Professor to be a role model for junior faculty, for students, and for the profession. The review for promotion to the rank of Professor is based on the accomplishments that have occurred since the faculty member's promotion or appointment as an Associate Professor at Ohio State, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national leadership and/or international reputation in the field.

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 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 visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university.

Criterion: Publications. Demonstration of sustained national and international recognition and impact for a coherent and thematic independent program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to Professor.

Evidence: Publications. It is expected that the faculty member will have a consistent record of high-quality

publications well beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor. The publications should be in high quality, peer-reviewed journals that have impact in the appropriate field(s) of study. Candidates can provide evidence demonstrating they meet this criterion through data from citation analysis, and the comments of external evaluators can also provide supporting evidence. Candidates can also provide evidence they meet this criterion through the citation index of individual papers as well as the overall citations of the body of work. Candidates should also provide evidence that they were instrumental in the research and writing of the publications through an annotated bibliography in the dossier that indicates individual contributions to each work.

The number of publications that satisfies these criteria will depend upon their quality and impact on the field. As a general guideline, within the disciplines of the Department, an average of 1-3 publications as senior author per year and 1-3 collaborative publications per year (3-6 total publications per year) would be expected. Publications of high scientific merit and/or in high impact factor journals are considered of greater importance than absolute numbers. Associate Professors with substantial teaching or service obligations greater than departmental norms may also publish fewer senior author manuscripts than typical. Examples of these activities include being a course director of a large graduate course, directing a core facility, or organizing a large national meeting. Substantive review articles and books will be given consideration in addition to research peer-reviewed articles.

Criterion: Research Funding.

Evidence: Research Funding. It is expected that candidates for promotion to Professor must have a record of significant and sustained NIH funding since their promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates can provide evidence they meet this criterion by demonstrating their research is supported by multiple NIH grants as PI (or MPI). Funding from other national agencies or foundations as PI, as co-investigator on NIH or other national grants, or from industry, is also taken as evidence of continued productivity and contribution to the field.

Criterion: Research Independence, Collaboration and Mentoring.

Evidence: At the Professor level, a candidate must have produced a unique and independent body of research that has been developed by the candidate, and that should show that the research program has benefited colleagues and students at the University and in the research community at large. Collaborations can provide evidence of mutual scientific accomplishments. Successfully mentored students and postdocs can provide evidence that research training is ongoing in the context of the research program and can also contribute to the teaching component of the dossier.

Criterion: Reputation as a Scholar.

Evidence: Reputation as a Scholar. The Committee will look for evidence that the candidate has been recognized as an important participant or leader in the research community. For promotion to Professor, the candidate must have played a national leadership role or attained international recognition for their research. Such evidence could include invitations to present research findings at other institutions and at national and international scientific meetings, appointments to editorial boards or repeated invitations to review manuscripts or grants, appointments to national review bodies such as NIH study sections or scientific advisory boards, responsibilities as an organizer of scientific meetings, invitations to provide critical reviews of a research topic, and assignments as a consultant to government agencies and private companies. External evaluators' comments can also contribute to this category.

The annual review document generated by the Chair for each faculty member at the Associate Professor level will comment on each of the above criteria with respect to progress and areas for improvement. The

overlapping categories given above provide a means to organize the accomplishments of individual faculty in their evaluation for promotion. These accomplishments should be compared to the University and Department Mission Statements in evaluating the progress of each faculty member towards the rank of Professor.

Criterion: Teaching and Service Excellence.

Evidence: Teaching and Service Excellence. A record of teaching excellence as an Associate Professor must continue to justify promotion to the rank of Professor. The faculty member should make new, unique and impactful contributions to the teaching mission as an Associate Professor. Evidence for exemplary teaching includes outstanding student and peer evaluations, course or workshop leadership and design, a Training Program Directorship, and teaching awards. The faculty member should have demonstrated involvement in regular didactic teaching. Promotion to the rank of Professor also requires service with distinction to the College of Medicine, The Ohio State University, or in a national context. The faculty member should make new, unique and impactful service contributions since Associate Professor. Criteria might include participation in leadership positions in a national society, participation in and appointment to management positions in College of Medicine, University or national committees, task forces and advisory groups and other leadership roles leading to the betterment of the organization being served.

3 Promotion of Clinical Faculty

Promotion for clinical faculty on the Clinician Educator pathway depends on excellence in teaching and education. The criteria for promotion are strongly related to the educational mission and include service, leadership and scholarship related to teaching. Since faculty in this category may have variability in their source of funding and percent appointment and may have variability in responsibilities to the university, the evaluation process must take these weighted commitments and responsibilities into consideration. Therefore, a description of faculty responsibilities should be included in the dossier.

Promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway
Criteria for promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor on the Clinician Educator pathway are the same as those for hiring directly into this position.

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway
The awarding of promotion to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor on the 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 cancer biology and genetics education but can also be related to scholarship or professional service. The clinician-educator pathway may reflect effectiveness as an educator of trainees at any level. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Criterion: Teaching and Mentoring. A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring in a wide variety of formats is required for promotion.

Evidence: Teaching and Mentoring. The teaching effort must be demonstrated as serving as course directors and/or new course development. Effectiveness may be measured by various metrics including, but not limited to curriculum design and implementation, innovative teaching practices, 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. 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 national activities. In all cases, evidence of improved educational processes

or outcomes is required such as by documenting curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and/or program or course development. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching of underserved populations are particularly valued.

Criterion: Service.

Evidence: Service. Service activities are those similar to those being considered for promotion to Associate Professor on the tenure-track and are expected to include local and national service. The amount of service will vary depending on the teaching load and salary recovery distribution of the candidate.

Criterion: Scholarship.

Evidence: Scholarship. The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed publications. Faculty in the Clinician Educator pathway may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain, such as papers on innovative teaching techniques, new curricula, or methods of evaluation. Alternatively, faculty may publish in their areas of expertise to form a basis of teaching colleagues and peers. These may include review papers, book chapters, as well as original investigator-initiated studies related to their area of expertise. Development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are to be considered published works.

Promotion to Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway
The awarding of promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor on the Clinician Educator pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of leadership or international recognition as an educator since being appointed to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor. Evidence of international recognition or national leadership should be related to education in cancer biology and genetics or more general biomedical science education but can also be related to scholarship or professional service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Criterion: Teaching and Mentoring.

Evidence: Teaching and Mentoring. A documented record of continued 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 serving as course director and/or involvement in new course development. Sustained positive teaching evaluations by students, trainees, local colleagues and/or peers are required. Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis. Multiple teaching awards and other honors are evidence indicative of this level of teaching excellence but are not required. Candidates must demonstrate impact on teaching and training programs, such as by documenting curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and/or program or course development. Candidates may also demonstrate teaching excellence through committee appointments in national education committees, such as the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, American Association of Higher Education, or Association of American Colleges and Universities. Candidates may also demonstrate excellence in teaching and mentoring through appointments or leadership positions in professional societies at the national level.

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

Criterion: Service.

Evidence: Service. Service activities are those similar to those being considered for promotion to Professor on

the tenure-track and are expected to include local and national service. The amount of service will vary depending on the teaching load and salary recovery distribution of the candidate. Examples of evidence candidates can provide indicative that they meet this criterion include committee-work for national education committees or for professional societies.

Criterion: Scholarship.

Evidence: Scholarship. The candidate must demonstrate continued contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed publications after promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. Publications may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain, such as papers on innovative teaching techniques, new curricula, or methods of evaluation. Alternatively, faculty may publish in their areas of expertise to form a basis of teaching colleagues and peers. These may include review papers, book chapters, as well as original investigator-initiated studies related to their area of expertise. Development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are to be considered published works. Scholarship may also be demonstrated by invitations to speak at national or international meetings or to professional societies on educational practices.

4 Promotion of Research Faculty

Promotion for research faculty depends on research scholarship and impact alone. The criteria for promotion are identical to the research criteria outlined above for tenure-track faculty. Scientific independence, high quality publications, extramural grant support and national/international reputation are primary. It is expected that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of 100% salary recovery from extramural sources. Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators, and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigator) is not required. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research Professor, a faculty member must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

5 Associated Faculty

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

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

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for

appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.4.

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

B Procedures

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

1 Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty

a Candidate Responsibilities

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

- **Dossier**
  Every candidate must submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with 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 Committee of Eligible Faculty makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him/her/them.

  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. Additionally, it is highly recommended that faculty members consult the College of Medicine's Dossier guidelines for information about how/where to enter information into the core dossier (APT Toolbox).

  Teaching
  The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a tenured or non-probationary candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated. Examples of documentation include:
  - Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class;
  - Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the Department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including number, provided in Section IX below);
  - Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the

publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including:
  - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses and dissertations, and undergraduate research
  - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
  - extension and continuing education instruction
  - involvement in curriculum development
  - awards and formal recognition of teaching
  - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
  - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
  - Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

Scholarship

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion (for tenured or non-probationary faculty) may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties. Examples of documentation include:

- Copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received;
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted);
- Scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including:
  - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television and websites;
  - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses;
  - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.

Service

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

- Service activities as listed in the core dossier including:
  - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
  - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
  - clinical services
  - administrative service to department
  - administrative service to college
  - administrative service to university and Student Life

    - advising to student groups and organizations
    - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
- Any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee Chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

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

- **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document**
  Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed using the Department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last 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 10 years before April 1 of the review year. If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available here, a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the Department.

- **External Evaluations**
  If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair, the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The candidate may provide no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

b Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the Department Chair.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
    - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
    - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 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 lack

of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
    - A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
    - **Late Spring**: Suggest names of external evaluators to the APT Chair and Department Chair. The external evaluators will be identified as described in Section VI.B.4 below.
    - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis together with the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service. The analysis will consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit or is a member of a Discovery Theme.
- Forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair. The evaluation will include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, to include in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

c Department Chair Responsibilities

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. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner.) 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.
- **Late Spring Semester**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Chair of or members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The Department Chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

- Select from among the Eligible Faculty a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The POD cannot be the same individual who Chairs the committee. The POD's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
- To make each candidate's dossier available electronically 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. The department Chair will leave the meeting at the request of the eligible faculty to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the Department review process:
    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
    - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, to include in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response to include in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the College of Medicine office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the Committee of 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 of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

Candidates will also be reviewed at the College and University levels. The Dean or Dean's designee will inform the candidate and the Department Chair of the College decision. The candidate and Department Chair will be provided with copies of those reports. The Department Chair is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the Executive Vice President and Provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the board of trustees (if positive).

Once the process starts, only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Department Chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the Department, the Chair shall inform the Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. In no case will tenure be granted subsequent to such withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

recommendation by the department Chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the Executive Vice President and Provost if the Dean's recommendation is negative.

3 External Evaluation Letters

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

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the Department of Cancer Biology and Genetics will ask for evaluations from faculty in programs that are nationally recognized in their field or subfields. Cancer biology and genetics are intensely interdisciplinary sciences in which scientists apply expertise in biology, genetics, oncology, mathematics, engineering, medicine and other fields. to study cellular, functional, behavioral, evolutionary, computational, molecular, cellular, structural and medical aspects of normal and cancer cells. Because cancer biology and genetics experts are often found outside of traditional academic departments, a specific list of institutions or even programs cannot be easily devised.

Accordingly, this department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators from the Big Ten Academic Alliance and the Association of American Universities. If a candidate's field of research requires additional expertise outside of AAU, a request for review and approval will be made to the College of Medicine.

The following principles will be applied in identifying external reviewers: the external reviewer 1) will be a distinguished expert in their field, as demonstrated by their scholarship credentials to include publications; creative work; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; 2) will be nationally or internationally known in the field related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects; and/or 3) where relevant, will be a distinguished, award-winning scholar or designer who is not affiliated with an academic institution.

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

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

A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant). External evaluators shall be nationally/internationally recognized experts in the applicant's field of research who are not former mentors, mentees, close personal friends, active collaborators, or have published or applied for grants together with the candidate within the past five years. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The Department of Cancer Biology and Genetics will only solicit evaluations from faculty above the rank of the candidate or Professors as indicated above.

In the case of an Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from Associate Professors.

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

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as 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.

A list of potential evaluators is assembled by Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, 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. Among the minimal five external letters, no more than two should be written by persons suggested by the candidate; the rest should be from persons suggested by the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty and the Department Chair. If more than five letters are received, 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 do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the Department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The Department 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/teaching 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 the 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 the Department's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

VII. Appeals of Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Decisions

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

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

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

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

VIII. Seventh Year Review

Under unusual circumstances, the Department may seek a seventh year review of a candidate who was denied tenure during the mandatory sixth year review. Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh-year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth-year (mandatory tenure) review. Approval to conduct a seventh-year review must be sought from both the Dean of the College of Medicine and the Executive Vice President and Provost. The request must contain documentation as to why such a review is merited. If the request is approved, the new review is a full review identical to sixth year review. If a negative decision is reached, the faculty member's termination date of employment is May 31 of the seventh year of service.

IX. 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 by faculty from this Department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is 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 and Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty oversee the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process with help from the Education Committee.

All clinical faculty at advanced ranks and tenured faculty in the Department are expected to provide peer-evaluation upon request by the faculty needing review. As needed, the Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Education Committee and/or the Chair of the Committee on Eligible Faculty, will appoint faculty members to evaluate the classroom or online presentations of tenure-track and clinical faculty at every rank. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute peer-evaluation service among the faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. There is a presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed.

Faculty evaluation of teaching will consist of two parts: review of lecture notes, materials and handouts; and first-hand observation in the classroom or online setting. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ascertain that evaluations are carried out on an annual basis. Faculty attending lectures are required to submit a written report in which they evaluate the content and style of presentation. The contents of this report are discussed with faculty during the annual review process. Faculty will be evaluated in regard to the organization, presentation and level of material, as well as student performance.

Frequency of peer-evaluation of teaching are as follows:

- Teaching of probationary tenure-track 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.
- Probationary clinical faculty will be reviewed at least once a year.

- Teaching of tenured Associate Professors, non-probationary Associate Clinical Professors, and non-probationary Clinical Professors will be reviewed at least once a 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 annual peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review.
- Teaching of tenured Professors will be reviewed at least once every two years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.
- Upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

Faculty seeking additional formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the Chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first four situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure Chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, 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 class visits, 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 he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.