

**Appointments, Promotion, and
Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
Department Molecular Medicine
and Therapeutics**

Approved by the Faculty: 06/30/2023

Revisions Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 8/4/2025

Table of Contents

I Preamble	4
II Department Mission	4
III Definitions.....	5
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1 Tenure-track Faculty	5
2 Research Faculty	5
3 Associated Faculty	6
4 Conflict of Interest	6
5 Minimum Composition	7
B Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee	7
C Quorum.....	7
D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	7
1 Appointment	7
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal.....	7
IV Appointments.....	8
A Criteria	8
1 Tenure-track Faculty	8
2 Research Faculty	9
3 Associated Faculty	9
4 Emeritus Faculty	10
5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	11
B Procedures	11
1 Tenure-track Faculty	11
2 Research Faculty	13
3 Transfer from the Tenure Track.....	13
4 Associated Faculty	13
5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	13
V Annual Performance and Merit Review.....	14
A Documentation	14

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty.....	15
1 Fourth-Year Review.....	15
2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period.....	15
C Tenured Faculty.....	16
D Research Faculty.....	16
E Associated Faculty.....	16
F Salary Recommendations.....	17
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	17
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion.....	17
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	17
2 Promotion to Professor.....	25
3 Promotion of Research Faculty.....	33
4 Promotion of Associated Faculty.....	33
B Procedures.....	34
1 Tenure-Track and Research Faculty.....	34
a Candidate Responsibilities.....	34
b Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee Responsibilities.....	37
c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities.....	38
d Department Chair Responsibilities.....	38
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty.....	40
3 External Evaluations.....	40
VII Appeals.....	41
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews.....	41
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	41
A Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	41
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	42
Appendix A: Example Institutions/Programs for Evaluation Letters.....	44

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 Volume 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](#).

II Department Mission

The **mission** of the Department of Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics is to utilize molecular, structural, engineered, cell biological, and preclinical models to advance basic science to clinical translation and improve health.

This mission will be achieved advancing the fundamental components of The Ohio State University and the College of Medicine; Education, Research, and Service.

The **vision** of the Department is to enhance translation of basic to clinical science by developing a collaborative, and innovative early translational science department designed to advance fundamental knowledge in the molecular and cellular basis of disease linking basic science to the clinic in key research areas with impact throughout OSU and the OSU College of Medicine through collaborative research, education programs, and involvement with Departments linking basic sciences to clinical care.

The Department intends to be a national/international leader in innovative translational science focused on three scientific areas of emphasis:

1. **Therapeutics:** Identify molecular targets for human disease and utilize structural and chemical biology to design and develop and test new therapeutic and delivery methods using new technologies.

2. Tissue Engineering and Stem Cells: To advance stem cell biology and tissue engineered system to enhance clinical translation and define mechanisms of tissue response to therapeutic and environmental challenges.
3. Molecular Medicine: To advance reductionist basic science biology to preclinical whole organ/body biology and clinical correlation using innovative model systems and computational biology.

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **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. In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake an appointment review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint faculty members, as need be, from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2 Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the

Department. In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake an appointment review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint faculty members, as need be, from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

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

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

3 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members follows a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B), a formal search, and candidate interviews. The reappointment and contract renewal of compensated associated faculty are decided by the Department head in consultation with the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. Initial appointments at senior rank, which likewise follow a job posting in Workday, a formal search, and candidate interviews, also require a vote by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and prior approval of the college dean.

Promotion Reviews

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

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

4 Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work will be expected to withdraw from an appointment or promotion review of that candidate.

5 Minimum Composition

In the event that the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a promotion review, the Department head, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

B Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee

The Department has an Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee that assists the eligible faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of at least 3 tenured professors and 2 tenured associate professors. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the Department chair. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible.

When considering cases involving research faculty the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee may be augmented by 2 nonprobationary research faculty members.

C Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty 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 head has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not 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.

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

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority (>50%) of the votes cast are positive.

- In the case of a joint appointment, the Department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment Department prior to his or her appointment.

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority (>50%) of the votes cast are positive.

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

IV Appointments

A Criteria

The Department of Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the Department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, scholarship and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the Department of Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics. 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.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

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

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

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

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

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

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure is not permitted.

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

2 Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year appointments. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance.

External appointees at the research associate professor or research professor level will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research and service as persons promoted within the Department.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria for promotion to these ranks. Research Associate Professor Appointment requires the candidate to have met the criteria listed above for Research Assistant Professor and established an independent program of research over a period of at least six years. It is expected that he/she 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, 2) demonstrated ability to obtain and sustain extramural grant support, and 3) other evidence of a nationally/internationally recognized research program (e.g., invitations to speak at national or international scientific meetings, etc., as listed for Tenure Track Faculty in Section VI.A.1). Research Professor Appointment requires the candidate to have met the criteria for Research Associate Professor and demonstrated a sustained and impactful research program. Criteria for evaluation of the candidate's research program includes 1) continuous high impact publications in the principle peer-reviewed journals, 2) sustaining competitive extramural funding, and 3) evidence of national/international recognition and prominence for their research program as listed for Tenure Track Faculty in Section VI.A.2.

3 Associated Faculty

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

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the Department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

4 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, 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 head outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-3) 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.

See the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available.

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

5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B Procedures

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

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

- recruitment of tenure-track, 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. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

During its initial three years, the Department of Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics will have a standing search committee. After that time, whenever a new search is initiated, the Department chair will appoint an ad hoc search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the Department.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo hiring practices training available through the college with resources from the [Civil Rights Compliance Office](#). Implicit bias training, such as that available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and](#)

[Ethnicity](#), is also required of all search committee members prior to any search. 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 search committee:

- Follows the recommendations and training of the Office of Academic Affairs on best practices for creating a fair hiring process.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to the Department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the Department office. If the faculty does not agree, the Department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

Virtual or on-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the Department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship, and may teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format and relevant accommodations for disability/impairment should be provided.

Following completion of virtual/on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate to the Department chair.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the 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 or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

2 Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the virtual or on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college dean.

3 Transfer from the Tenure Track

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

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. A transfer, once approved is not reversible.

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

4 Associated Faculty

The appointment of all compensated associated faculty members follows a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B), a formal search, and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department chair in consultation with the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. The reappointment and contract renewal of compensated associated faculty are decided by the Department chair in consultation with the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure committee.

Exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college dean.

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 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure committee.

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

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

5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

The Department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review 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 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.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual performance and merit review of faculty members 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. 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 performance and merit 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 incorporation into the file.

A Documentation

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

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

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

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

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the Department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

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

1 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the Department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

C Tenured Faculty

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

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the Department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

D Research Faculty

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

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the Department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E 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 or her performance, future plans, and goals.

The Department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment 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 or her 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.

F 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 Executive Committee. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal salary distributions. 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 V-A above) for an annual performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new 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 must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, if a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

The Department of Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics will apply high standards for the awarding of tenure. A positive tenure decision has long-term impact on the career of the candidate, reputation of the University and Department, and has a long-term impact on the trajectory of the Department over time. Criteria will vary to some degree based on the specific responsibilities of individual candidates. Nonetheless, all candidates will be expected to have achieved a consistent standard of excellence in their performance. Faculty members are evaluated on the totality of their performance in all mission areas (research, teaching and service) with greatest emphasis on their primary areas of responsibility within the Department, College, and University. Most Tenure Track faculty in Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics spend the majority of their effort in scholarship, thus tenure decision will be weighted toward defined metrics in this area and insufficient or average performance cannot be fully 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.

The charts that follow list the criteria and types of evidence the Department has identified as those that support promotion to associate professor with tenure. ***Please note that these are not intended to be an exhaustive list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those report. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.***

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have established evidence of “sufficient” or greater levels of teaching .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will be required to submit at least 3 peer evaluations of teaching, evidence of “sufficient” teaching performance reviews from learners, including from involvement in training programs. This can include of reviews of professional education lectures at continuing medical education events, or at regional, national, or international meetings • A significant contribution to the Department teaching mission as agreed upon in consultation with the Department Chair.
Developed new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, or computer software for classes or other education programs • Positive trajectory of peer and student evaluations of teaching and/or evaluations.
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	
Developed the ability to attain the educational benefits of students’ views in the classroom	<p>Summaries of the following demonstrating positive outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summative and non-summative evaluation/feedback from students/residents/fellows • Faculty peer teaching reviews •
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students/residents throughout the instructional process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive qualitative student/resident comments • Feedback on Carmen/Canvas/Medhub sites
Treated students/residents/postdocs/fellows with respect and courtesy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive qualitative student/resident comments • Exit interview summaries demonstrating respect and courtesy
Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of involvement and specific outcomes in curriculum development • Develop curriculum and courses beyond usual teaching and service expectations • Leadership or involvement in curriculum development for T or K-level programs for pre and postdoctoral learners
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	
Served as research mentor to undergraduate students	
Demonstrated exceptional teaching outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards and/or formal recognition of teaching at the department, college, or university levels

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations on pedagogy and teaching at institutions beyond Ohio State, in professional societies, at national and international conferences • Exceptional Grand Round/lecture evaluations if available • Exceptional professional meeting evaluations if available
Served as an advisor to postdoctoral fellows and/or demonstrated involvement in fellowship training programs (e.g T or K programs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful Mentoring of postdoctoral researchers based on evaluations and outcomes • Successful Mentoring of clinical fellows based on evaluations and outcomes • Successful Mentoring formally for obtaining F or K award series or similar from internal or foundation sources based on evaluations and outcomes • National/International presentations for trainees • Placement of trainees in positions in academics, industry or practice

Please note that these are not intended to be an exhaustive list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstration of impact and a national reputation of an independent program of research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will submit a complete list of manuscripts, describe their role in each, as well as the full manuscripts for the 5 most impactful manuscripts on which the candidate is first or senior/corresponding author. • Candidates must have evidence for recognition for work independent from prior mentors. • Evidence of recognition at the national level may include extramural funding, national-level service, invited lectures, and invited manuscripts or book chapters, as defined below.

<p>Demonstrated thematically focused research/scholarship/creative outcomes that contributes to knowledge in area of expertise and relationship to his/her scholarly agenda, unit mission and societal needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On average, at least 15-25 papers more than 10 of which the candidate is first or corresponding offer are expected, <i>Importantly, these numbers are intended as general guidelines and thus productivity below these ranges can result in a positive promotion and tenure review if strong impact can be established for the candidate's independent research</i> (e.g., papers in the highest impact journals may substitute for several in lower-impact journals). • Complete publication record including journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. • Funding as principle investigator (including as one of several PIs on a multi-PI award) on national level research awards from federal agencies, national-level societies/foundations is generally expected • Funding as a project leader or Co-leader on a multi-investigator team science award, such as a P or U level grant from NIH or similar federal mechanism. This role is equivalent to PI status on an independent or multi-PI award. • Awards from industry, or private sector, as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator with documented focused contributions support, or as a core leader on a team award contribute to evidence of scholarship but do not replace independent research funding. • White papers that can be shown to have influenced policy or practice • Patents and evidence of technology transfer • Leadership or translational work in the context of clinical trials and clinical research
<p>Demonstrated high quality scholarship/research of teaching</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarship of teaching including pedagogical papers, textbooks, monographs and compilations of essential education resources, including online teaching resources. • Creation of digital, simulation or other learning tools
<p>Demonstrated successful entrepreneurship</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials transfers • Technology commercialization • Formation of startup companies • Licensing and options agreements • Consulting work with industry
<p>Demonstrated influence on the work of others</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citations of published work as documented by metrics such as H-index or citation indices • Significant portion of the publications authored by the candidate with his or her own students, postdoctoral scholars, or fellows. • Collaborative team-based research demonstrating the candidate's contributions to collaborative publications, and recognizable as a unique and creative contribution to the overall body of work

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited reviews in journals and invited external lectureships at national meetings and/or other academic institutions. Membership on national level task forces (eg federal or professional society) Invited service on federal or other national-level review panels for research funding (e.g. NIH study section) External reviewer positive comments
Demonstrated high quality research/scholarship/print or digital scholarship/creative outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication in peer reviewed books, journals, and monographs with expectations as noted above Journal ranking, citation index, H-index, impact on field Primary journals of faculty member's discipline with expectations as noted above Engagement/outreach: scholarly recognition including peer reviews of the activity and its results Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, outreach, or creative work External reviewer positive comments
Demonstrated impact of research, scholarship or engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited lectureships at national meetings and at other academic institutions in the nation and internationally H-index and other citation metrics in published works of others in the field Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses Invited service on national level grant review panels Membership on national level task forces (e.g NIH or national professional society) Evidence of intellectual property such as copyrighted materials, software, multimedia presentations Materials transfer agreements
Provided ongoing quantity of research/scholarship outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient productivity over time according to norms in the field and responsibility assignments as defined above for manuscript numbers and grant funding.
Demonstrated unique contribution to a line of inquiry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External peer reviewers comment that the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession in an area. Documentation of consistent contribution demonstrating expertise to multiple scholarly, research or engagement outcomes Recognition by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioners as evidenced by invitations to speak regionally and nationally in prestigious forums. Invited reviews and book chapters in area of research in the field Evidence of uniquely creative approaches to framing research questions, with unique cultural or demographic impact of the work in publications or grant proposals
Demonstrated the candidate's ability to conduct work and to mentor future scholars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate serving as primary advisor for graduate students and postdoctoral researchers/fellows. Evidence of support for undergraduate, graduate, professional students, and postdoctoral researchers/fellows including, but not limited to, financial, grants, and positive mentoring reviews

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate, graduate, professional students, postdoctoral researcher/fellows and residents' advisee grants (e.g. NIH F, T, K) awards • Advisee awards from department/college/university • Student and postdoctoral researcher/fellow positions post-graduation • Evidence of recruiting and mentoring of a broad array of student and other trainee backgrounds. 	
Demonstrated participation in high quality collaborative work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program or Core leadership in team science awards • Collaborative publication in which candidate has derined a substantive role in publication list • Development or involvement in interdisciplinary team clusters • Collaborative translational work as part of clinical trials. 	
Demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research and scholarly program funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding from federal agencies (e.g. NIH/NSF, DoD) as PI (or one of a multi-PI team), PI of competitively reviewed awards from other national level sources (e.g. AHA or ACS) of similar levels, or PI of competitively awarded national/international foundations is mandatory. • Leadership of a project in a team award (e.g. NIH P or U level award) is considered equivalent to PI of an individual award. • Leadership (overall PI) of investigator-initated single or multi-institutional clinical trials. • Local site PI on clinical trials or Co-I on research projects is supportive but does not replace PI as defined above. • Defined pattern of contribution to interdisciplinary cluster 	
Developed national/international reputation in the candidate's field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition by external reviewers that the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession and the extent to which that person has been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioners • Invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, other Universities, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals. • Evidence of a positive trajectory of citations in peer manuscripts 	
Demonstrated a high degree of professional ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High degree of ethical conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of undergraduate, graduate and professional students, residents, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators • Contributes to a positive and compelling working environment, particularly one that welcomes all faculty, staff and students 	
Participated in high quality engaged scholarship/research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-reviewed independent publications independent of their mentor using the general framework as noted above. • Grants and contracts designed to develop and deliver outreach innovations; including implementation science • Issuance of patents and evidence of intellectual property such as materials, software, multimedia presentations • Involvement in patient or survivorship groups • Impact on public policy or guidelines in the field 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement or leadership of national level committees in professional organizations including those related to public outreach.
<p><i>Please note that these are <u>not</u> intended to be an <u>exhaustive</u> list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.</i></p>	
SERVICE	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Demonstrated excellence in service to the Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership on at least one departmental committee. • Achieves or exceeds expected service as defined by annual review • Awards and prizes for service to the department
Demonstrated excellence in service to the college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service (by appointment or election) on college level committees or on interdisciplinary committees within the college • Document service that advances the University's commitment to serve individuals from all backgrounds. • Annual evaluations document excellence in service to college • Awards and prizes for service to college
Demonstrated excellence in service to the university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointed or elected service on university or inter-college ad hoc or standing committees, councils, task forces, and boards • Service or leadership of interdisciplinary teams across colleges • Document service that advances the University's commitment to serve all students • Awards and prizes for service to University
Demonstrated excellence in service to the students of Ohio State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentorship awards from undergraduate or graduate school programs • Leadership of programs to advance education program for the entire student population • Students receiving awards under the mentorship of the candidate
Demonstrated significant service to a profession or field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement with professional journals (journal editorships, reviewer) and professional societies (offices or committees) • Professional conference organization • Consultation activity with industry • Awards and prizes for service to profession • Any available documentation (e.g., letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier
Development and advancement of the interdisciplinary cluster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement or leadership in interdisciplinary research awards or teams within the department or college • Involvement or leadership in interdisciplinary research or teams across colleges or as part of institutes or University Centers

Demonstration of high quality administration to the University at any level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions including positive change
Demonstrated community-engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of activities and quality indicators within the Community Setting • Documentation of unique service to disadvantaged communities.
Demonstrated outstanding creation of print or digital media for a public audience and/or public websites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the creation of infrastructure as well as content and specific contributions by individual to enable community engagement. • Exhibitions and conferences for community involvement • Documentation of community engagement as part of research or team science activities

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

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. The following guidelines are general in nature and are intended to serve as a minimum range of criteria in the categories of research, teaching and service that the candidate should achieve before application for promotion to Professor. The academic achievements of the candidate for his/her entire career will be considered, with focus on the professional development of the candidate since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national leadership and/or international reputation in the field.

Professors are expected to serve a mentor and/or chair mentoring committees for early career faculty and demonstrate proficiency in outcomes, demonstrate outstanding doctoral and postdoctoral level advising with documentation of outcomes, and are expected to be leaders at the College and University levels in addition to being leaders in the Department. Finally, Professors are expected to demonstrate recognition and reputation at the national and international levels.

Scholarship, as manifested by communication of scientific discovery through publications and presentations, is the most important general criterion for promotion. In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research, teaching and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable

impact upon the mission of the Department, college and university. Metric evidence that the candidate has a sustained, eminent record of achievement recognized nationally and internationally can be demonstrated by accomplishment of key scholarly achievements as depicted in the following charts:

The Department of Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics will apply high standards for the awarding Professor. Criteria will vary to some degree based on the specific responsibilities of individual candidates. Nonetheless, all candidates will be expected to have achieved a consistent and continuous standard of excellence in their performance. Faculty members are evaluated on the totality of their performance in all mission areas (research, teaching and service) with greatest emphasis on their primary areas of responsibility within the Department, College, and University. Most Tenure Track faculty in Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics spend the majority of their effort in scholarship, thus tenure decision will be weighted toward defined metrics in this area and insufficient or average performance cannot be fully counterbalanced by excellent performance in other areas. 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 and since promotion to Associate Professor.

The charts that follow list the criteria and types of evidence the Department has identified as those that support promotion to professor. ***Please note that these are not intended to be an exhaustive list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those report. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.***

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have established evidence of "sufficient" or greater levels of teaching .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will be required to submit at least 3 peer evaluations of teaching, evidence of "sufficient" teaching performance reviews from learners since the last promotion. • Evidence of leadership level (overall PI or Key Personnel) involvement in training programs. • Exceptional reviews of lectors or continuing medical education events at regional, national, or international meetings. • Contribution to the Department teaching mission as agreed upon in consultation with the Department Chair.
Developed new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, or computer software for classes or other education programs • Positive trajectory of peer and student evaluations of teaching and/or evaluations
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	
Developed the ability to attain the educational benefits of all students in the classroom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summative and non-summative evaluation/feedback from students/residents/fellows • Faculty peer teaching reviews • National meeting/CME meeting positive comments for lectures from professional learners

Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students/residents throughout the instructional process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive qualitative student/resident comments • Exit interview summaries demonstrating respect and courtesy
Treated students/residents with respect and courtesy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive qualitative student/resident comments • Positive peer evaluations • Exit interview summaries demonstrating respect and courtesy
Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of involvement and specific outcomes in curriculum development • Leadership in developing the curriculum and courses beyond usual teaching and service expectations • Leadership in curriculum development for T or K-level programs for pre and postdoctoral learners
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	Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduated Masters and Ph.D. students as thesis advisor through attainment of terminal degree. • Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research • Services as graduate faculty representative • mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
Served as research mentor to undergraduate students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mentoring of undergraduate research students • promoting student participation in research presentations (e.g., Denman) • serving as mentor or committee member for honors research theses
Demonstrated exceptional teaching outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards and formal recognition of teaching at the department, college, or university levels • Presentations on pedagogy and teaching at institutions beyond Ohio State, in professional societies, at national and international conferences • Exceptional Grand Round evaluations • Exceptional professional meeting evaluations •
Served as an advisor to postdoctoral fellows and/or demonstrated involvement in fellowship training programs (e.g T or K programs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead a training program for fellows such as a T or K program • Mentoring of postdoctoral researchers with positive career outcomes • Mentoring of clinical fellows • Mentor for T, F, or K award series or similar from internal or foundation sources • National/International presentations for trainees • Placement of trainees in positions in academics, industry or practice • Exceptional evaluations as mentor
Serve and Mentor for Junior Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring Junior Faculty serving on mentoring committees • Mentor for K99-R00, K08, K22 or other early career award • Positive feedback from junior faculty mentees • Promotiion of mentee to Associate Professor

*Please note that these are **not** intended to be an **exhaustive** list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.*

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstration of impact and a national reputation of an independent program of research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will be required to submit a complete list of manuscripts and their role in each, as well as the 5 most impactful manuscripts on which the candidate is first or senior/corresponding author. • Candidates must have evidence for recognition for sustained impactful independent work. • Evidence of recognition at the national and international levels may include continuous extramural funding, a track record of invited lectures, and invited manuscripts or book chapters, as defined below.
Demonstrated thematically focused research/scholarship/creative outcomes that contributes to knowledge in area of expertise and relationship to his/her scholarly agenda, unit mission and societal needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a general guideline, an average of 2-3 publications as senior author per year of original scientific work, and 2-3 collaborative or review publications per year would be expected. Therefore, candidates for promotion to professor typically have a minimum of 20 to 30 peer-reviewed publications since their promotion to Associate Professor. Importantly, while these numbers are intended as general guidelines, fewer papers in the highest impact journals may substitute for more in lower-impact journals. The impact of these publications, rather than sheer numbers, will be the major criterion for promotion. Emphasis will be on the quality of the work and evidence of continuous high impact thematic scientific inquiry as recognized by their peers and as addressed by the external evaluators. • Complete publication record including journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. • Funding as principle investigator (including as one of several PIs on a multi-PI award) on national level research awards from federal agencies, national-level societies/foundations is generally expected. • Funding as project leader or Co-leader on a multi-investigator team science award, such as a P or U level grant from NIH or similar federal mechanism. This role is equivalent to PI status on an independent or multi-PI award. • Overall PI (or Co-PI) of a team science award (e.g. NIH P or U award). • Evidence of successful competing renewals of awards on which the candidate is PI or equivalent as defined above .

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards from industry, or private sector/foundations (unless documented as nationally competitive awards), as principle investigator, or core-leader on a team science award support promotion but do not replace independent research funding. • White papers that can be shown to have influenced policy or practice • Patents and evidence of technology transfer • Leadership or translational work in the context of clinical trials and clinical research 	
Demonstrated high quality scholarship/research of teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarship of teaching including pedagogical papers, textbooks, monographs and compilations of essential education resources, including online teaching resources. • Creation of digital, simulation or other learning tools 	
Demonstrated successful entrepreneurship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials transfers • Technology commercialization • Formation of startup companies • Licensing and options agreements • Consulting work with industry 	
Demonstrated influence on the work of others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citations of published work as documented by metrics such as H-index or citation indices • Leadership or standing membership on federal or other national-level review panels for research funding (e.g. NIH study section) • Leadership or membership of national level (government or professional society) task forces or guidelines teams in the area of research emphasis. • Outcome indicators of activity to external audience and to the profession/discipline that indicate impact and importance in the candidate's field (and any other fields/communities where one engages) • Development of program materials and technical reports • Significant portion of the publications authored by the candidate with his or her own graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, junior faculty, and other collaborators. • Leading collaborative team-based research demonstrating the candidate's contributions to collaborative publications as senior or first author and recognizable as a unique and creative contribution to the overall body of work • Invited reviews in journals and invited external lectureships at national meetings and/or other academic institutions . • Invited plenary or keynote talks at national meetings or at other Universities both nationally and internationally • External reviewer positive comments 	
Demonstrated high quality research/scholarship/print or digital scholarship/creative outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication in peer reviewed books, journals, and monographs with expectations as noted above • Journal ranking, citation index, H-index, impact on field 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary journals of faculty member's discipline with expectations as noted above • Engagement/outreach: scholarly recognition including peer reviews of the activity and its results • Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses • List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, outreach, or creative work • External reviewer positive comments 	
Demonstrated impact of research, scholarship or engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited lectureships at national and international meetings and at other academic institutions in the nation and internationally • High level H-index and other citation metrics in published works of others in the candidate's primary field of inquiry • Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses • Standing membership or leadership on national level grant review panels • Leadership or membership of national level (government or professional society) task forces or guidelines teams in the area of research emphasis. • Evidence of intellectual property such as copyrighted materials, software, multimedia presentations • Materials transfer agreements 	
Provided ongoing quantity of research/scholarship outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient productivity over time as defined above for manuscript numbers and grant funding. 	
Demonstrated unique contribution to a line of inquiry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External peer reviewers comment that the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession in an area. • Recognition by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioners as evidenced by invitations to speak nationally and internationally in prestigious forums. • Documentation of consistent contribution demonstrating expertise to multiple scholarly, research or engagement outcomes • Invited reviews and book chapters, and editorships, in area of research in the field • Evidence of uniquely creative approaches to framing research questions, with unique cultural or demographic impact of the work in publications or grant proposals 	
Demonstrated the candidate's ability to conduct work and to mentor future scholars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate serving as primary advisor for successfully graduated Ph.D. and Masters-level graduate students, and undergraduate students. • Placement of graduated students into professional positions post-graduation • Serve as primary mentor for postdoctoral researchers/fellows who have placed into independent positions (academic or industry). • Evidence of support for undergraduate, graduate, professional students, and postdoctoral researchers/fellows including, but not limited to, financial, grants, and positive mentoring reviews 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate, graduate, professional students, postdoctoral researcher/fellows and residents' advisee grants (e.g. NIH F, T, K) awards • Advisee awards from department/college/university • Student and postdoctoral researcher/fellow positions post-graduation • Evidence of recruiting and mentoring of a breadth of student and other trainee backgrounds 	
Demonstrated participation in high quality collaborative work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of team science awards • Program or Core leadership in team science awards • Collaborative publications in which candidate has derived a substantive role in publication list • Development and leadership of interdisciplinary team clusters • Collaborative translational work as part of clinical trials. 	
Demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research and scholarly program funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track record of continuous funding from federal agencies (e.g. NIH/NSF, DoD) as PI (or one of a multi-PI team) is mandatory. • Leadership of a project in a team award (e.g. NIH P or U level award) is considered equivalent to PI of an individual award. • Leadership of a federally funded team science award (e.g. NIH P or U award) • National or international grants that are competitively reviewed from private foundations and/or national/international associations • Leadership or documented involvement of single or multi-institutional clinical trials. • Defined pattern of leadership or major contribution to interdisciplinary cluster 	
Developed national/international reputation in the candidate's field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition by external reviewers that the faculty member has made a substantial and continuous contributions to the discipline or profession and the extent to which that person has been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioner • Leadership or membership of national level (government or professional society) task forces or guidelines teams in the area of research emphasis. • Invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums at the national and international levels, other Universities, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals. • Evidence of a positive trajectory of citations in peer manuscripts • Awards from professional societies • Election to national/international honorary societies (e.g. national academies, ASCI, AAP). 	
Demonstrated a high degree of professional ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest degree of ethical conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of undergraduate, graduate and professional students, residents, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to a positive and compelling working environment, particularly one that welcomes all faculty, staff and students
Participated in high quality engaged scholarship/research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-reviewed independent publications using the general framework as noted above. • Continuous funding as PI (defined above) of research awards that are designed develop and deliver outreach innovations; including implementation science • Issuance of patents and evidence of intellectual property such as materials, software, multimedia presentations • Involvement in patient or survivorship groups • Impact on public policy or guidelines in the field • Involvement or leadership of national level committees in professional organizations including those related to public outreach.

Please note that these are not intended to be an exhaustive list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above.

SERVICE

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Demonstrated excellence in service to the Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of at least one department committee. • Achieves or exceeds expected service as defined by annual review • Awards and prizes for service to the department
Demonstrated excellence in service to the college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service (by appointment or election) on college level committees or on interdisciplinary committees within the college • Task force or search committee leadership • Document service that advances the University's commitment to all students, faculty and staff • Annual evaluations document excellence in service to college • Awards and prizes for service to college
Demonstrated excellence in service to the university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointed or elected service or leadership of university or inter-college ad hoc or standing committees, councils, task forces, and boards • Service or leadership of interdisciplinary teams across colleges • Document service that advances the University's commitment to all students, faculty and staff • Awards and prizes for service to University
Demonstrated excellence in service to the students of Ohio State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentorship awards from undergraduate or graduate school programs • Leadership of programs to advance the entire student population • Students receiving awards under the mentorship of the candidate
Demonstrated significant service to a profession or field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement with professional journals (journal editorships, reviewer) and professional societies (offices or committees)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional conference organization • Consultation activity with industry • Awards and prizes for service to profession • Any available documentation (e.g., letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier
Development and advancement of the interdisciplinary cluster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of or major roles in interdisciplinary research awards or teams between departments or as part of centers. • leadership or major roles in interdisciplinary research or teams across colleges or as part if institutes or University-wide Centers
Demonstration of high quality administration to the University at any level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions including positive change
Demonstrated community-engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of activities and quality indicators within the Community Setting • Documentation of unique service to disadvantaged communities.
Demonstrated outstanding creation of print or digital media for a public audience and/or public websites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the creation of infrastructure as well as content and specific contributions by individual to enable community engagement. • Leadership of exhibitions and conferences for community involvement • Documentation of supporting community engagement as part of research or team science leadership activities

3. 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.

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

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member must have a national 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.

4 Promotion of Associated Faculty

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

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

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.3.

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

B Procedures

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

1 Tenure-Track and Research Faculty

a Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed, of other than the Department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to Department guidelines.

- **Dossier**

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

While the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed.

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 such as clinical rotations if the faculty has clinical responsibilities. Faculty peer reviews of at least two lectures 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 it believes 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;
- Medhub reports for clinical evaluations for teaching interns, residents, and fellows in clinical programs
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the Department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including number, provided in Section IX below);
- Copies of 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 the evaluating parties.

Examples of scholarship documentation include:

- Copies of all books, high impact articles, and high impact scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received;

- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted);
- Scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television and websites;
 - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses;
 - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.

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.

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

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

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

- **External Evaluations** (see also External evaluations below)

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

b Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

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

- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; 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 being included in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this Department's cases.

c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

d Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The Department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) 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 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, the Department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a Department chair of any Department in which the candidate has a joint appointment. This evaluation should be shared at the Department level of the review and incorporated with the review by the Department chair.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, 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 calendar days from receipt of the letter from the Department chair, for incorporation in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for incorporation in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with

the Department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

3 External Evaluations

This Department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the programs listed in Appendix A. Scholars who are highly recognized in a field from the department, but are not located at a peer program, can also be included with a short justification related to their expertise and impact.

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

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This Department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed in Appendix A. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

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

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

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

VII Appeals

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

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

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh-Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth-year (mandatory tenure) review.

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) is required in every course offered in this Department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department chair oversees the Department 's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the Department chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in 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 Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors at least once every other year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.
- To review, upon the Department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need 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 Department 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 promotion and tenure chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the Department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Appendix A: Example Institutions/Programs for Evaluation Letters

In the Big Ten, there are individual Divisions within Departments serving those Departments at the University of Minnesota and the University of Michigan, as well as education programs around Molecular Medicine at the University of Maryland.

Nationally, there are very few departments of similar name or scope to Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics. Several of the most successful Departments with similar scopes of emphasis are noted below. Notably, evaluation letters may be obtained from outstanding and well-qualified researchers in departments of different names and scope based on the area of emphasis of the applicant. Several exemplary programs are noted below.

Scripps Research Institute: Department of Molecular Medicine
University of California, San Diego: Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine
University of Southern California: Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine
University of Arizona: Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine
City of Hope/Beckman Research Institute: Department of Molecular Medicine
University of Texas, San Antonio: Department of Molecular Medicine and Institute of Biotechnology

The following have multidisciplinary centers, institutes, or graduate programs centered on Molecular Medicine:

Johns Hopkins University
University of Washington
Yale University