Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University College of Medicine Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity

Approved by the Faculty: 08/07/2024
Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 09/23/2024
Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 09/22/2025

TABLE of CONTENTS

Article I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty, the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the Department head.

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

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this Department and 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.

Article II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The research mission of the Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity is to foster a creative, interdisciplinary environment for investigation of fundamental questions in microbial pathogenesis and immunology, ultimately translating new knowledge into practical therapies that benefit society. 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. We will provide outstanding collaborative, educational opportunities in the areas of infectious diseases, immunology, and microbial pathogenesis that improve human health globally. Our research goals are to:

1. Lead interdisciplinary programs that promote the development of top-tier researchers, whose findings fundamentally advance our knowledge of host-pathogen relationships and broadly impact human health.
2. Develop and use cutting-edge infectious disease and immunology model systems to accelerate discovery of diagnostic tools, therapeutics, and vaccines that can be translated into improved personalized patient care.
3. Maintain a collaborative and respectful training environment with strong mentorship that fosters intellectual creativity and instills the next generation of scientists with a passion to perform cutting-edge research in microbial infection and immunity.
4. To train graduate, post-graduate, professional, and undergraduate students in the conduct and methodology of research in microbial infection and immunity; and to provide service for the general benefit of the life sciences community within the COM and The Ohio State University, as well as at the local, state, and national levels.
5. Be international leaders in microbiology and immunology research.

The educational mission of the Department is to strive for excellence in the didactic teaching of basic and applied aspects of microbial infection and immunity to graduate and professional students. The graduate education mission encompasses research training of Masters and PhD students, i.e., providing experienced mentors, state-of-the-art laboratory facilities and curricula to prepare students for careers in contemporary microbial pathogenesis, immunology, and other related fields. The Department provides education and training for medical and graduate students in interdisciplinary programs, including the Ohio State Biochemistry Program, the Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program, the Medical Scientist Training Program, the Immunology and Immunotherapeutics Graduate Program (I2GP), the Master of Science in Immunology and Microbial Pathogenesis, the Neuroscience Graduate Program, the Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology Graduate Program, the Comparative Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program, and the Biophysics Graduate Program.

The service mission of the Department is to disseminate knowledge and provide administrative contributions to the biomedical community at OSU and to the citizens of Ohio. Professional service also involves contributions 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.

Article III. DEFINITIONS

Section 3.01 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 (>50%) in the Department.

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

(a) Tenure Track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

Initial Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all Tenure Track Faculty in the Department.

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors 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.

(b) Clinical Faculty

Appointment Reviews

Initial Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, or clinical professor, the eligible faculty consists of all Tenure Track Faculty whose tenure resides in the Department and all Clinical Faculty whose primary appointment is in the Department (>50%).

Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all faculty tenured in the Department of equal or higher rank than the position requested and any non-probationary Clinical Faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested whose primary appointment is in the Department.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

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

(c) Research Faculty

Appointment Reviews

Initial Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, the eligible faculty consists of all Tenure Track Faculty whose tenure resides in the Department, and all Clinical and Research Faculty whose primary appointment is in the Department (>50%).

Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all faculty tenured in the Department of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary Research Faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested whose primary appointment is 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, all nonprobationary research associate professors, and all nonprobationary research professors.

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

(d) Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all Tenure Track Faculty whose tenure resides in the Department, and all Clinical and Research Faculty whose primary appointment is in the Department (>50%). The recommendation to the Department chair is the responsibility of the search committee.

Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all faculty tenured in the Department of equal or higher rank than the position requested, any non-probationary Clinical Faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate position requested whose primary appointment is in the Department, and all non-probationary

Research Faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate position requested whose primary appointment is in the Department), and prior approval of the college dean.

The eligible faculty for reappointment reviews of Associated Faculty consists of all faculty tenured in the Department of equal or higher rank than the position requested, any non-probationary Clinical Faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate position requested whose primary appointment is in the Department, and all non-probationary Research Faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate position requested whose primary appointment is in the Department.

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, or 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 3.01(a), (b), or (c).

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 3.01(a).

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the department's AP&T committee.

(e) Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;

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

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

(f) 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.

Section 3.02 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee

The Department has an Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee that consists of the eligible faculty (as dictated by this document for each type of review and rank) to manage matters pertaining to appointment, promotion and tenure issues. The Department Chair will appoint an APT Committee Chair, who will serve a three-year, renewable term, and will approve the APT Committee's choice of a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD), who will serve two-year, renewable term.

Section 3.03 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.

Section 3.04 Recommendation from the APT Committee

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted.

Abstentions are not counted as votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. All faculty must participate in the discussion to be eligible to vote. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed. For appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion, a positive recommendation from the eligible faculty 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 any appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

Article IV. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Section 4.01 Criteria

The Microbial Infection and Immunity Department is committed to making faculty appointments that enhance, or have the strong potential to enhance, the quality of our community. 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

The Tenure Track exists for those faculty members who strive to achieve or who have achieved and sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated by a national and international level of scholarship recognition. In addition, excellence in teaching and service to The Ohio State University is required, but alone is insufficient for progress on this track. The Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity is responsible for establishing and enforcing its criteria for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure that are consistent with aforementioned requirements.

Appointment decisions for Tenure Track faculty positions must be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree, and generally involves extensive postdoctoral training in a relevant field of study.

Salary coverage expectations for Tenure Track faculty are outlined in their letters of offer at the time of hire.

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

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

(b) Assistant Professor, Tenure Track
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 exclude time from the probationary period.

An appointee at the Assistant Professor level normally will have a Ph.D. and/or M.D., and significant post-doctoral experience. Candidates for appointment at this rank will be expected to have demonstrated a significant level of accomplishment in the establishment of a research career. 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 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 education and mentoring.

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 merited by the faculty member's record of achievement. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 and the provisions of paragraphs (G), (H), and (I) of this rule. If tenure is not granted, a single terminal year of employment is offered (twelve months from notification). See below Article V on Annual Performance and Merit Reviews, including mandatory fourth year review, and Article VII on Promotion and Tenure Review for more.

(c) Associate Professor or Professor, Tenure Track
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. All appointments to the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor with tenure, and offers of prior service credit require prior 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 for new hires 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. 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.

Under circumstances of demonstrated ability, a position at the Associate Professor level may be filled by an individual recruited from elsewhere, who has not received academic tenure at the previous institution. The major criteria for evaluation of the candidate's research program are that the candidate has built a robust and independent research program that has national impact in the fields of microbial infection or immunology as indicated by: (1) a body of publications in relevant peer-reviewed journals; (2) impact of independent scholarship, as measured by journal impact factors and Eigen factors, citations indexes, the candidate's H-index, 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 agencies that have a recognized peer-review process for making awards); (4) demonstrated success in training graduate students and/or post-doctoral scholars; and (5) 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.). External letters will be sought for evaluation of the candidate's research efforts, 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.

Positions at the level of Professor are offered to those who have either satisfied the criteria below for promotion to this rank, or for new recruits 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 include invited presentations at prestigious national and international meetings, elected office in national and international research organizations, chairing national and international scientific meetings, standing membership on 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.

In general, appointments at the rank of Associate Professor will entail tenure. Appointments at the rank of Professor without tenure is not permitted. However, in some cases, candidates for the rank of Associate Professor may be appointed without tenure for a probationary period as specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, Section (B) (1) (Length of probationary period). Upon petition of the Department and College, the probationary period, not to exceed four years, may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate, but why tenure is not. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered. 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 Vice Dean of Faculty Affairs, 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 will be reviewed by the Department committee of eligible faculty with a recommendation provided to the Chair.

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.

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

(2) Clinical Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other clinical faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract at all ranks is probationary, 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. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. Tenure is not granted to Clinical Faculty.

The Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity supports only the Clinical-Educator pathway. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs for biomedical investigators and students at the health system, College, or Department level. Clinical Faculty members are expected to contribute to the Department's research and education missions, as reflected by participation in graduate program development and teaching. While Clinical Faculty may serve as the PI on a grant proposal, securing extramural funding as PI is not expected. However, participation as Co-I or collaborator in extramural funding proposals may be expected of some Clinical Track Faculty per their letter of offer. Clinical appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

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 students and postdoctoral scholars, and to be a Principal Investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the Graduate School as detailed in the Graduate School Handbook.

(a) 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.

(b) Assistant Clinical Professor
Candidates for appointment as an Assistant Clinical must provide clear and convincing evidence that they satisfy the following criteria:
• An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or possession of equivalent experience.
• For individuals not possessing a terminal degree in a relevant field, advanced research and/or clinical training and experience in the field is highly desirable.
• Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

Additional criteria for Assistant Clinical Professor may include an initial record of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by a developing body of research, scholarship, publications and/or creative work that are related to education; and evidence for training program development and teaching.

(c) Associate Clinical Professor and Clinical Professor

Appointment at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor requires that the individual has a significant record of developing new educational programs, as well as a sustained track record of teaching and administrative excellence. Appointment to a specific senior rank will depend on the same criteria used for promotion to that rank (see below).

(3) Research Faculty

Research Faculty appointments are fixed term contract appointments (one to five years) that do not entail tenure. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to Research Faculty. 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.

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. 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. In accord with Faculty Rule 3335-7-34, 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 Faculty Rule 3335-5-29 and detailed in the Graduate School Handbook.

Research Faculty appointments will require one hundred percent salary recovery that will be derived from extramural research grants, for which either the Research Faculty member or another faculty member will be Principal Investigator. The Principal Investigator must certify to the Department Chair that sufficient research grant funds exist to cover the salary over the period of the contract. Space made available for Research Track Faculty, which depends on extramural funding, will be consistent with the Department, Center, or College Space Policy.

While continued collaboration with the original Principal Investigator is likely, a Research Faculty member is expected to begin publishing an independent body of work as corresponding author. Peer-reviewed publications and grant support independent of the original Principal Investigator are expected within three years of appointment. These expectations are consistent with career development goals for researchers in the Department. Research Faculty will be appointed at a level consistent with the research criteria stated above for Tenure Track Faculty in the Department.

(a) Research Assistant Professor
Positions may be offered to individuals of exceptional research promise, who typically will be long-standing members in the research group of a Tenure Track Faculty in the Department. Criteria for these positions include 1) an earned doctoral or other terminal degree in a relevant field of study, 2) completion of sufficient post-doctoral training to provide a basis for establishment of an independent research program, 3) demonstrated research productivity as reflected in papers published in peer-reviewed journals, 4) adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the Statement on Professional Ethics by the American Association of University Professors, and 5) demonstrated ability to secure extramural grant support, or clear evidence for the likely prospects of same.

(b) Research Associate Professor
Appointment requires the candidate to have met the criteria listed above for Research Assistant Professor, and to have 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 they will have published a significant body of independent work. Criteria for evaluation of the candidate's research program includes 1) publications in the principal peer-reviewed journals in the field of microbiology and

immunology, 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 or internationally recognized research program (e.g., invitations to speak at national or international scientific meetings, etc., as listed for Tenure Track Faculty).

(c) Research Professor
Criteria for appointment include demonstration of an independent, internationally recognized research program over a period of at least six years since appointment as Research Associate Professor. 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 and international meetings, invited reviews in high impact biochemical journals, and similar indicators listed above.

(4) Associated Faculty

Associated Faculty as defined in Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (C) are persons with adjunct titles, clinical practice 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 Faculty titles. Persons holding Associated Faculty titles are not eligible for tenure. Associated Faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated Faculty may be reappointed.

(a) 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 who provide significant uncompensated or compensated service to the instructional and/or research programs of the Department and who require a faculty title to perform that service. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Significant service would include teaching of one or more courses, advising graduate students or serving on graduate committees, and serving as a co-investigator on a research project. Such individuals may be either non-University or University employees compensated on a non-instructional budget. Adjunct appointments are made for the period in which the service is provided, not to exceed three years; renewal is contingent upon continued significant contributions. Adjunct appointments are at the discretion of the Department Chair after consultation with the Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (APT) Committee. These appointments require formal review every year by the Chair if they are to be continued.

(b) Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%
An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment of tenure-track titles at 49% FTE or below. Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1 – 49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

(c) 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, but who spend a limited period of time in residence at this institution to participate in the Department's instructional and research programs. A visiting appointment cannot exceed three continuous academic years of service. [Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (C)(3)]. Visiting appointments are at the discretion of the Department Chair after consultation with the advisory APT Committee. The appointments can be made for only one year at a time. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

(d) 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). Appointments of Lecturers and sources(s) for compensation will be at the discretion of the Department Chair after consultation with the APT Committee.

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

(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 3.01) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department chair. The Department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, 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 coverage by MI&I) are faculty members from other departments who make important contributions to the Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity. 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 cannot vote on Department Patterns of Administration, Workload Policy, and Appointments, Promotion and Tenure issues. These faculty members may also vote on matters when serving on *ad hoc* Departmental committees. Courtesy appointments will be reviewed annually by the Chair and will be renewed every three years by vote in the APT Committee. Titles assigned to courtesy appointments must mirror those held in the individuals' University appointments.

Section 4.02. Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment

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 Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. 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 available resources to support the appointment. The Dean of the College must give prior approval for faculty searches. This approval will be based at least in part on a determination that the above criteria have been met.

A Search Committee consisting of three or more faculty will be appointed by the Chair. The majority of the Search Committee should be composed of faculty members from the Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity.

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 EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

The SHIFT Framework serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent applicant pools, conduct consistent and fair 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.
- "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 Department Chair.
- "Phase 4 | Extend Offer" provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- "Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard" offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- "Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search" is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the Department Chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate

Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

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
Searches for Clinical Faculty generally proceed identically as for Tenure Track Faculty.

(3) Research Faculty
Searches for Research Faculty generally proceed identically as for Tenure Track Faculty.

(4) Transfer from the Tenure Track
Transfers from a Clinical or Research Faculty appointment to the Tenure Track are not permitted. However, Clinical or Research 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 Clinical or Research Faculty 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 Clinical or Research Faculty appointment, tenure or tenure eligibility is relinquished, and (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 3.01(a) above.

The transfer must be approved by the University 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 University 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 University 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 4.02 above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department Chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department APT Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Joint Appointments
The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section 4.01(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 University 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. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the courtesy Department justifying the appointment, as well as the candidate's CV and an approval letter from the chair of their TIU, should be considered at a meeting of the eligible faculty. The chair and APT Committee chair must review all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, may take recommendations for nonrenewal from the APT Committee, and must conduct a vote at a meeting of the eligible faculty. A Courtesy Faculty appointment forwarded from the Department for approval by the College must have been made consistent with the Department's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by the University Faculty Rules, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Office of Human Resources.

Article V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS

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 department chair. However, 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 department chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the Department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; 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 3335-3-35) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

Section 5.01 Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the documents described below to the Department chair at least one week prior to the scheduled face-to-face meeting in the spring semester.

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

In addition, on an annual basis, probationary faculty members will provide to the chair a written report describing activities during the preceding year, as well as plans for the next year. It is expected that this report will include student teaching evaluations, a summary of funded and pending grants, as well as a list of published and submitted papers. The report should also include a list of all service activities (i.e., Department, College and University committees), as well as a summary of all other professional activities. The report may also contain any information documenting why it was not possible to achieve objectives and whether commitments made by the Department, College, or University were not fulfilled.

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

Article VI of this document.

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

Section 5.02 Probationary Tenure Track Faculty
(a) Annual Reviews
The Department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a letter of evaluation that includes a recommendation whether or not to renew the probationary appointment. A copy of this letter is retained in the candidate's file, along with the faculty member's comments, if they choose to respond, and is sent to the dean of The College of Medicine. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if provided).

If the chair recommends reappointment, the decision is final. In the event that the Chair believes 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, and the case is sent to the dean for College level review. The dean makes the final decision in the matter.

(b) Fourth Year Review
The process for the Fourth Year Review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, except that 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 APT Committee will separately review the candidate's dossier and the annual review letters from the three preceding years. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty members vote by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The eligible faculty members forward 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) 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.

(c) 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 non-renewal decision based on the results of a formal performance review must be conducted in accord with Fourth Year Review procedures described above. Notification of non-renewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08.

Per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, probationary appointments may be terminated for fiscal or programmatic reasons. When non-renewal is based on fiscal or programmatic reasons, the faculty member should be advised of this possibility and formal notice of non-renewal should be provided as soon as possible after the need to terminate is established. Non-renewal 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 non-renewal could not be anticipated when the appointment was made and are expected to be long-lasting.

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

(d) 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.

Section 5.03 Tenured Faculty
The chair or the chair’s designee will meet with all tenured faculty members and provide a written evaluation of their performance. 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 or international 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 graduate programs, including service on thesis committees).

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

Faculty members may provide written comments on the review.

Section 5.04 Clinical Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for Clinical Faculty is identical to that for Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty respectively. In the first term, clinical appointments at all levels in the Department are probationary. In the penultimate contract year of a Clinical Faculty member's appointment, the Department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

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.

Full reviews by the eligible faculty on the APT Committee will take place in the penultimate year of the appointment, with a specific recommendation based on a majority vote of being made to the chair regarding whether the appointment should be extended and a new contract offered. Non-probationary Clinical Faculty may participate in the review of Clinical Faculty of lower rank.

The chair will conduct an independent review and will inform the Clinical Faculty member whether the appointment will be renewed for another term. Subsequent appointment will be for three 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.

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. 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 Clinical Faculty appointments. In addition, a contract may be renegotiated during a contract period, but only with the voluntary consent of the Clinical Faculty member.

Section 5.05 Research Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for Research Faculty is identical to that for Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty respectively. In the first term, research appointments at all levels in the Department are probationary. In the penultimate contract year of a Research Faculty member's appointment, the Department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

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.

Full reviews by the APT Committee will take place in the penultimate year of the appointment, with a specific recommendation based on a majority vote being made to the chair regarding whether the appointment should be extended and a new contract offered. Non-probationary Research Faculty may participate in the review of Research Faculty of lower rank.

The chair will conduct an independent review and 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.

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 Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) or financial exigency (see Faculty Rule 3335-5-02.1). Termination decisions for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by Faculty Rules. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 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.

Section 5.06 Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals. the Department chair will decide whether the appointment will be renewed based on departmental needs and faculty performance. The Department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee, 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, the department chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's decision on reappointment is final.

Section 5.07 Salary Recommendations

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

In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with the department administrator. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section 5.01 above) for an annual performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

Article VI. PROMOTION and TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

All Tenure Track Faculty members are expected to engage in research, teaching and service. 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 (Faculty Rule 3335-6-02). Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service also is defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

Section 6.01 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 and civility.

Section 6.02 Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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. Review for promotion to this rank will be based primarily on the candidate's accomplishments since their appointment as an Assistant Professor.

The Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity will apply 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 slightly according to the particular responsibilities of each faculty member, every candidate will 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. Insufficient performance in the primary area (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. While all accomplishments to date will be taken into consideration, particular attention will be paid to the accomplishments since a faculty member's appointment at The Ohio State University.

(a) 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, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in the field of microbial pathogenesis and/or immunology. As laid out in the College of Medicine APT 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 as corresponding author in peer-reviewed, high impact factor or top-cited journals in the field(s) is mandatory. Funding from NIH or an equivalent Federal Agency (e.g., NSF, DoD, USDA, etc.) as a Principal Investigator, including the Multiple Principal Investigator mechanism as contact PI, is mandatory for promotion. Additional established indicators of a national reputation are requirements for promotion and tenure. Specific criteria for evaluation of the candidate's research program include:

(1) Achievement of National Recognition and Impact on the Field
First and foremost, 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. There are several measures that will be considered by the APT Committee as evidence of scientific impact: (a) Publications as first or senior author in the field's highest impact factor or top-cited journals, (b) citation rates (the number of times a paper has been cited by other publications), (c) the candidate's h-index or other citation metrics, (d) invitations to speak at national and international meetings and for seminars at other institutions, (e) appointment to editorial boards or to review for top-level journals, (f) invitations to write review articles, (g) participation on steering, guideline, or advisory committees of national organizations, (h) serve on grant review panels, (i) receipt of national scientific awards, (j) productive collaborations with external researchers, and (k) 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 Procedures 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 1-2 years before review for promotion and tenure 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 its impact 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.

(2) 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 reasons must be clearly stated, especially with regard to independence of the candidate's research program. 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. Publications as corresponding author in the principal, peer-reviewed journals of a field would be considered suitable for meeting the criteria. It is expected that independent, publications as corresponding author will constitute a substantial portion of the publication list. However, faculty members are encouraged to participate in collaborative multidisciplinary research, and it is therefore recognized that a faculty member's record of scholarship will include papers on which they are a co-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 specific roles in team scholarship are communicated in the dossier and demonstrate unique intellectual and/or leadership contributions.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the successful candidates should publish, on average, at least one peer-reviewed publication as senior or co-corresponding author, and at least 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. In general, candidates will have published 15-20 peer-reviewed research papers since their appointment as Assistant Professor. 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. While these numbers are intended as general guidelines, it is also possible that productivity below these ranges could result in a positive promotion and tenure review if strong impact can be established for the candidate's independent research (e.g., papers in the highest impact journals may substitute for several in lower-impact journals). Emphasis will 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 since being appointed as an assistant professor at The 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. However, the impact of these publications, rather than sheer numbers, will be the major criterion for promotion.

(3) Demonstrated Ability to Obtain and Sustain Competitive Grant Support
Funding as Principal Investigator (or Multi-Principal Investigator as contact PI) on an R01, R35, U, or P grant from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or an equivalent grant (e.g., from National Science Foundation, NSF or Department of Defense) is a mandatory requirement for promotion. Additionally, a candidate should demonstrate the capability to sustain funding; for example, by competitive renewal of an NIH R01 or equivalent grant or receipt of: (i) peer-reviewed funding from other national agencies or foundations (e.g. American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, etc.), (ii) securing a second R01 or equivalent grant, (iii) awards as co-Investigator on NIH or NSF grants, or (iv) funding from pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies. In addition to R01 grants, any of the latter provide a strong indicator of national reputation but are not by themselves sufficient demonstration of the ability to obtain and sustain national support.

(4) National Reputation
Achievement of national reputation is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure. Indications that the faculty member has achieved national/international recognition may include, but are not limited to invited addresses, election to national societies, awards from national societies, awarding of fellowships from national organizations to the candidate's trainees, invitations to review grants, editorial assignments, conference participation and organization (e.g., chairing a symposium session), documented invitations for external collaborations, and invitations to contribute book chapters or reviews.

(5) Research Independence and Collaboration
It is recognized that research collaboration is important for attaining new knowledge, and it is encouraged. Fruitful collaborations usually involve important and recognizable contributions from each of the collaborators. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is a 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 evident. Evidence that the candidate for promotion has been instrumental in the research and writing of publications should be provided by an annotated bibliography that indicates individual contributions to each work.

(6) Demonstrated Success in Training Graduate and Postdoctoral Scholars
Documented success in degree completion by trainees, as well as impactful student mentorship, evidenced by completion of candidacy exams, publications, fellowships, invited talks, and awards to trainees who are sponsored by the faculty member, also can contribute to the teaching component of the dossier.

(7) 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.

Tenure Track Faculty members in the Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity are primarily engaged in research, although excellence in teaching and service is required for promotion and tenure.

(b) Teaching
For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- demonstrated adherence to the OSU Board of Trustees Bylaws and Rules, Chapter 3335-8 - Instruction (Faculty Rule 3335-8);

- demonstrated professional ethical conduct, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics;

- 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;

- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process, as evidenced through student and peer reviews;

- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process, as defined in course syllabi;

- 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, if a need is identified through peer or annual reviews.

- received “sufficient” teaching performance reviews from learners and peers.

Faculty evaluation of teaching will consist of a review of lecture notes, materials and slides, and firsthand observation in the classroom. The Graduate Studies Committee, in consultation with the chair, will appoint eligible faculty members to evaluate classroom presentations of all faculty, no less than twice per year. If possible, reviews of various modes of teaching are advised (e.g., lecture-based and facilitated journal clubs). It is the responsibility of the Department chair and the Graduate Studies Committee to ascertain that evaluations are carried out on an annual basis. Faculty reviewers will submit written reports (template available) to the Graduate Studies Committee chair in which they evaluate the content and style of presentation.

(c) Service

A candidate for promotion and tenure shall also be held to a high standard of service, which includes service to the College, University, scientific community, as well as to the Department. Candidates are expected to participate in at least one Departmental committee, as well as provide service beyond the department to the College or University (committee membership not required). 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.

Section 6.03 Promotion to the Rank of Professor

The promotion to Professor is not automatic, nor dependent on the number of years of service. Promotion in rank from Associate Professor to Professor will be considered in any year with no regard to any minimum period of time while in rank as Associate 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 Microbial Infection and Immunity expects an individual ready for promotion to Professor to be a role model for early career faculty, for students, and for the profession. In this regard, candidates are expected to have served on mentoring committees for other faculty and students. 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 international reputation in the field.

(a) Publications
Demonstration of sustained national and international recognition and impact for a coherent, thematic, and independent program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to Professor. 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 the top-cited, peer-reviewed journals that have impact in the appropriate field(s) of study. This may be documented by data from citation analysis, as well as by reference to the comments of external evaluators. A further evaluation is the citation index of individual papers, as well as the overall citations for the body of work. Evidence that the candidate for promotion has been instrumental in the research and writing of the publications should be provided by an annotated bibliography 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 2-3 publications as senior author per year and 2-3 collaborative publications per year would be expected. While these numbers are intended as general guidelines, fewer papers in the highest impact journals may substitute for more in lower-impact journals. Substantive review articles and books will be given consideration in addition to research peer-reviewed articles. The candidate's citation rate will be documented and verified by the Procedures 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.

(b) 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. The

research program should be supported by multiple NIH or equivalent grants with the candidate 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.

(c) Research Independence, Collaboration and Mentoring
At the Professor level, a candidate must have produced a unique and independent body of research that has been developed by the candidate, and will 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 training is ongoing in the context of the research program and can also contribute to the teaching component of the dossier.

(d) Reputation as a Scholar
The candidate must be recognized as an important participant or leader in the research community. For promotion to Professor, the candidate must have played a national leadership role and attained international recognition for their research. Such evidence could include invitations to present research findings at other institutions, as well as 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 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.

(e) Teaching and Service Excellence
A record of continuing teaching excellence as an Associate Professor is required 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. Evidence of sustained graduate and post-graduate training as well as invited talks and the receipt of fellowships from national organizations to the candidate's trainees is also expected. 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 their appointment as 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.

Section 6.04 Promotion of Clinical Faculty

Promotion for Clinical Faculty depends primarily on excellence in teaching, education, service, and administration, although accomplishments in research will be considered. Criteria for these categories are identical to those outlined above for Tenure Track Faculty.

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

(a) For promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality achievements in education, including, but not restricted to, the establishment of new courses, programs, or teaching methods, as well as outstanding administration of the Department's educational mission. Involvement in community outreach will also be considered. Evaluation letters, solicited from University colleagues, will be considered by the APT Committee and Department Chair as part of this process.

(b) For promotion to Clinical Professor, a faculty member must have a national reputation for building and sustaining educational programs. This could include invitations to speak at national conferences, creating programs that reach outside of Ohio State, and publication of scholarly articles on education in peer-reviewed journals. In addition, the candidate must show evidence for continued excellence in teaching and administration. Evaluation letters, solicited from colleagues at Ohio State and at least two external institutions, will be considered by the APT Committee and Department Chair as part of this process.

Section 6.05 Promotion of Research Faculty

Promotion for research faculty depends on research scholarship and impact alone, with criteria identical to those outlined above for Tenure Track Faculty. Scientific independence, high quality publications, extramural grant support and national/international reputation are primary. The distribution of effort for research faculty is 100% research and scholarly pursuit.

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

(a) 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.

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

Section 6.06 Promotion of Associated Faculty

Associated faculty members are not eligible for tenure and are normally reappointed annually, unless otherwise specified in their appointment letter. Associated faculty members are expected to make recognized contributions to scholarship in the field of Microbial Infection and Immunity

(a) 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 Associate Faculty appointment. Reappointment will be based on documented sustained contributions to the Department and to the field.

(b) The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

(c) Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section 4.01(4).

(d) Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

Section 6.07 Procedures for Promotion

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 OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook.

(a) Tenure-track, Clinical, and Research Faculty

(1) Candidate Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- To 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 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee and the Procedure Oversight Designee 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.

- Once the process starts, only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure after 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.
- The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. This includes student and trainee reviews and scores of lectures and other reviewed teaching. Faculty peer reviews of at least one lecture per year from within OSU or from outside lectures are required. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if they believe such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

  Examples of teaching 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 Article IX (b) below);
  - Copies of high impact 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
    - mentoring medical students, residents, and clinical fellows
    - clinical teaching activities
    - extension and continuing education instruction
    - involvement in curriculum development
    - awards and formal recognition of teaching such as 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.

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

Examples of scholarship documentation include:

- A list of all published papers, books, and chapters, which is included in the dossier. 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.

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

Examples of service 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 or clinical services
  - administrative service to department or administrative service to college

    - administrative service to university and Student Life or 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 Department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

- The candidate's citation rate will be documented and verified by the Procedures 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.

- The candidate will indicate the APT document under which the candidate wishes 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 the start date of their current appointment, 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, 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.

- The candidate will provide a list of up to five names as potential external evaluators, and a list of no more than three names should the candidate like to exclude individuals from this process. The Department Chair decides whether exclusion as an external evaluator is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

(2) APT Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the APT Committee are as follows:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.

- To consider annually, in the spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide

whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the APT 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 APT 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 for one year. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for nonprobationary clinical and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

  - A decision by the APT Committee to permit a review in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Department chair, or any other party in the review to making a positive recommendation.

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

- To attend all meetings of eligible faculty except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

  - Late Spring: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for two years after approval by the Department chair. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

  - Late Spring: Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section 6.07(e) below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

- Summer - 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.

- Conduct a confidential in-person vote on the candidate's promotion and/or tenure after a thorough discussion.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service, taking into consideration 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. Include the outcome of the committee's vote, and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair.

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

- 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 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.

(3) Department Chair Responsibilities

Shared responsibilities of the Department and APT Committee chairs are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status, For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.

- Late Spring Semester: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluation Letters below.)

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

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

- To charge each member of the eligible faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.

- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, a Department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

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

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

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

    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and Department chair

    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Department chair

    - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department chair, indicating whether or not they expect to submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

- To forward the completed dossier to the College office by that office's deadline..

- To receive the APT Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the Department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

There is no limitation to the number of times that an untenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion and tenure review.

Candidates will also be reviewed at the College and University levels. 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).

b. 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 6.07 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 chair is final in such cases).

c. External Evaluation Letters

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

Peer:

Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan
Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Indiana University
Department of Pathology, Microbiology and Immunology, Vanderbilt University
Department of Immunology, University of Pittsburgh
Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Case Western Reserve University

Aspirational:

Department of Microbiology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, University of Alabama, Birmingham (UAB)
Department of Microbiology and Immunology, School of Medicine, Emory University
The Center for Biofilms Engineering (CBE) at Montana State University

Department of Microbiology and Immunology, School of Medicine, University of Maryland, Baltimore
Department of Pathology and Immunology, Washington University in Saint Louis

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

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all Tenure Track faculty 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.

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:
1. 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 (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The Department of Microbial Infection and Immunity will only solicit evaluations from Professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed 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.

2. 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 letters result from the first round of requests.

A list of potential evaluators is assembled by the APT Committee, the Department chair and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Among the minimal five external letters, no more than two should be written by persons suggested by the candidate; the remainder should be from persons suggested by the APT Committee and the chair, with at least one letter from each category. 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/professional practice faculty can be found here.

A candidate should not solicit external evaluations or initiate contact 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.

Article 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.

Article 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 requires approval of 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.

Article IX. PROCEDURES for STUDENT and PEER EVALUATION of TEACHING

(a) Student Evaluation of Teaching
Two methods are used by the department to gather student evaluation of teaching. First is the University administered Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) which is required for all courses offered by this Department, with the exclusion of independent study courses (X998, X999). For SEI reviews, faculty members should actively encourage student participation by choosing a day late in the semester and provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation (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. The second method used is a Departmental-specific, electronic form that is administered by the Graduate Studies Committee chair. This form is shared with all students via each course's Carmen page and enhances the SEI reviews by collecting individual-lecturer reviews and information more relevant to the Department's teaching focus.

(b) Peer Evaluation of Teaching
The Director of Graduate & Post-graduate Education oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process. The Department Chair and Director of Graduate & Post-graduate Education appoint a Graduate Studies Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the Department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the Graduate Studies Committee as they pertain to Peer Evaluation of Teaching are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary Tenure Track and Clinical Faculty at least once per year during the first two years of service, and at least twice more before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- To review the teaching of tenured and nonprobationary Associate Clinical Professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six-year period and of having at least two peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.

- To review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary Clinical Professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.

- To review, upon the Department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

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