

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Neuroscience

Approved by the Faculty: January 24, 2024

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: October 24, 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. Clinical Faculty	6
3. Research Faculty	6
4. Associated Faculty	6
5. Conflict of Interest	7
6. Minimum Composition	8
B. Advisory Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (aAPT) Committee	8
C. Quorum	8
D. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	9
1. Appointment.....	9
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	9
IV. Appointments	9
A. Criteria	9
1. Tenure-track Faculty	10
2. Clinical Faculty	12
3. Research Faculty	14
4. Associated Faculty	15
5. Returning Retiree	16
6. Emeritus Faculty	17
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	17
8. Joint Appointments	18
B. Appointment Procedures	18
1. Tenure-track Faculty	19
2. Clinical Faculty	20
3. Research Faculty	21
4. Transfers: Track and TIU	21
5. Associated Faculty	22
6. Joint Appointments	22
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	23
V. Annual Performance and Merit Review	23
A. Documentation	24
B. Annual Review Procedures - Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	25
1. Fourth-Year Review	26
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	26
C. Annual Review Procedures - Tenured Faculty.....	27
D. Annual Review Procedures - Clinical Faculty	27
E. Research Faculty	28

F. Associated Faculty	28
G. Salary Recommendations	28
VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	29
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	29
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	29
2. Promotion to Professor	36
3. Clinical Faculty	39
4. Research Faculty	42
5. Associated Faculty	43
B. Procedures	43
1. Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty	43
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty	50
3. External Evaluations	51
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals.....	53
VIII. Reviews in the Final Year of Probation	53
IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	53
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	54
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	54
X. APPENDICES.....	56
A. Research Scientists.....	56
1. Research Scientist and Senior Research Scientist Appointments	56
2. Promotion of Research Scientists to Senior Research Scientists	57
B. Faculty Checklist for Annual Review	58
C. Guidelines for assessing time allocated to service and teaching/mentoring (for tenure-track and clinical faculty).....	60
D. Annual Review Benchmarks for Scholarship – Research Output and Research Impact (for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty).....	64
E. Annual Review Benchmarks for Teaching, Education & Mentoring (for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty)	66
F. Annual Review Benchmarks for Service (for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty)	67
G. Annual Review Benchmarks for Clinical Faculty.....	68

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 of Neuroscience (the “Department”) and its faculty are subject.

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

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the Department of Neuroscience’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 of Neuroscience and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to the Department’s mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to the Department 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 **research mission** of the Department of Neuroscience is to foster a creative, interdisciplinary environment that investigates fundamental questions in cellular, molecular, behavioral and systems neuroscience with the goal of producing new knowledge that benefits society. Faculty are responsible for funding their research programs through grant support, patent royalties or other mechanisms. Faculty will disseminate knowledge acquired from their research through timely publication and other scholarly endeavors.

Our research goals are to:

1. Lead interdisciplinary research programs that promote the development of top-tier researchers, whose findings fundamentally advance general and specialty areas of neuroscience.
2. Use cutting-edge model systems and technical innovations that accelerate discovery of basic structure/function relationships in brain, spinal cord and peripheral nerve, and mechanisms of neurological function in health and disease.
3. Maintain a collaborative training environment with strong mentorship that fosters intellectual creativity and instills the next generation of scientists with the passion and skills to perform cutting-edge research in neuroscience.
4. Train graduate, post-graduate, professional, and undergraduate students in the conduct and methodology of research in neuroscience.
5. Be national and international leaders in neuroscience research.

The **educational mission** of the Department of Neuroscience is to strive for excellence in the didactic and interactive teaching of basic and applied aspects of neuroscience to undergraduate, graduate and professional students. The graduate education mission encompasses research training of both Masters and Ph.D. students; i.e., providing experienced mentors, state-of-the-art laboratory facilities and curricula to prepare students for careers in contemporary neuroscience and related fields.

The **service mission** of the Department of Neuroscience is to disseminate knowledge and provide administrative contributions to the Department, the general biomedical and academic communities within and outside OSU and to society in general. Professional service also involves various contributions (e.g., peer review, committee service, etc.) to national agencies (e.g., NIH, NSF, Society for Neuroscience, etc.), private foundations, publishing houses, scientific societies and more. Administrative service involves active faculty participation in the governance and operations of the Department, College and/or University.

III. Definitions

A. *Committee of the Eligible Faculty*

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their primary appointment in the Department of Neuroscience and must be at a rank higher than the candidate being considered.

Courtesy faculty or joint faculty with <50% FTE in the Department of Neuroscience are not eligible faculty.

The Department of Neuroscience Chair, the Dean and Assistant/Associate/Vice Deans of the College of Medicine, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

In the Department of Neuroscience, this committee is Chaired by the Chair of the advisory Appointment, Promotion, & Tenure (aAPT) Committee.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2. Clinical Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a clinical instructor, assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, or clinical professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track, clinical and research faculty in the Department of Neuroscience.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary clinical faculty (i.e., clinical faculty that have been reappointed beyond their initial contract) of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **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, clinical and research faculty in the Department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty (i.e., research faculty that have been reappointed beyond their initial contract) of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, all clinical faculty, and all research faculty in the Department. For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all those with non-probationary clinical titles and tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.
- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the aAPT committee.

5. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

In addition, an individual who has had personal or professional conflicts with the candidate are ineligible to participate in the discussion and vote. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair, chair of the aAPT committee, or Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) to remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

6. Minimum Composition

If it is not possible to convene a committee of at least three Eligible Faculty members to undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit (TIU) within the college.

B. Advisory Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (aAPT) Committee

The Department of Neuroscience has an Advisory Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (aAPT) Committee. The aAPT committee consists of all tenured Professors with primary appointments in the Department of Neuroscience. The committee's full range of duties is described later in this document (Section V.B). Briefly, the aAPT committee assists the Department Chair with various department administration tasks and supports the committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing faculty appointment, evaluation and promotion and tenure issues. The aAPT committee does not vote on the suitability of candidates for promotion and tenure, rather, this committee provides the above listed services then ultimately presents the case for appointment, promotion and tenure for each faculty candidate, pro and con, to the committee of the Eligible Faculty, whose composition and duties are defined above. The final vote of the Eligible Faculty is then forwarded to the Department Chair and College AP&T Committee.

When considering cases involving clinical faculty, the aAPT Committee may be augmented by as many as three non-probationary clinical faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

When considering cases involving research faculty, the aAPT Committee may be augmented by as many as three non-probationary research faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is 75% of the Eligible Faculty in the Department of Neuroscience not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the Eligible Faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

Note that faculty with a scheduling conflict that precludes them from participating in a meeting that requires quorum of the Eligible Faculty must seek approval for the absence from the Department Chair. Unexcused absences count toward the quorum of Eligible Faculty members.

D. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

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

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 two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the Department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the Department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

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

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

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university’s system of record for faculty and staff. 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 to what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor. Although the Department should make every effort to avoid these appointments, an appointment at the rank of instructor is appropriate when the candidate has not completed the terminal degree or other relevant training at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor and the letter of offer should indicate the specific benchmarks and achievements required for promotion to assistant professor. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. 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. Unless there are unique circumstances, the College of Medicine does not recommend requesting prior service credit. This request must be approved by the Department's Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, the Dean of the College, and the University Office of Academic Affairs, and if approved, cannot be revoked except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

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

- Anticipated receipt of an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Individuals who have completed all the requirements of their terminal degree, but who have not obtained the final degree at the time of initial employment will be appointed as an instructor. In addition, appointment at the rank of instructor is appropriate for individuals who, at the time they join the faculty, do not have the requisite skills or experience to fully assume the full range of responsibilities of an assistant professor.
- Evidence of potential for excellence in scholarship. Such evidence might include peer-reviewed publications in a mentored setting, but insufficient evidence of an independent, creative, and productive program of research with potential for external funding.
- No findings of faculty misconduct as brought forward through the Faculty Misconduct Background Check process.
- A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors as defined in Appendix C of the [College of Medicine APT document](#).
- In aggregate, accomplishments related to the above criteria should be sufficiently compelling that the appointee is judged to have significant potential to attain tenure and a distinguished record as a faculty member in the College of Medicine.

Assistant Professor. An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary. During a probationary period, a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Tenure cannot be awarded upon appointment at the rank of assistant professor. An assistant professor must be

reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the mandatory review year (6th year of appointment). However, promotion and tenure may be granted by following the promotion and tenure review process at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement so merits. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the provision of University Rule [3335-6-08](#) and the provision of paragraphs (6), (H), and (I) of University Rule [3335-6-03](#).

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

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

Criteria to be considered for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor on the tenure-track are identical to those described above for Instructor, except the candidate must have:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.
- Early evidence of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by the initial development of a body of research, scholarship, and creative work.
- Evidence of the candidate's potential for an independent program of scholarship or leadership within a productive research program as well as a strong likelihood of independent extramural research funding or extramural funding through team science work.

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 should not occur.

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

2. Clinical Faculty

The Department of Neuroscience supports only the Clinical-Educator pathway. In the unlikely event that an appointment to the Clinical-Scholar or Clinical-Excellence pathway is being considered, the Department will defer to using the most recently approved College of Medicine guidelines for both the appointment and promotion procedures governing these pathways.

The clinical pathway exists for those faculty members whose principal career focus is outstanding teaching/education. Clinical faculty members will generally not have sufficient time to meet the scholarship requirements of the tenure-track within a defined probationary period. For this reason, the nature of scholarship for the clinical faculty differs from that in the tenure-track and may be focused on a mixture of academic pursuits including the scholarship of pedagogy, community engagement and education, as well as new knowledge discovery.

Clinical Faculty are expected to make substantial contributions to the Department's education mission, as reflected by participation in undergraduate, graduate or professional program development and teaching. While Clinical Faculty may serve as the PI on grant proposals, securing extramural funding as Principal Investigator is not expected. However, participation as Co-I or collaborator in extramural funding proposals may be expected of some Clinical Faculty per their letter of offer. Clinical appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the Department.

Clinical Faculty members are eligible to serve on Department, College and University committees and task forces. Clinical Faculty also are eligible to advise and supervise graduate students and postdoctoral trainees and to be a Principal Investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the Graduate School as detailed in the [Graduate School Handbook](#). Approvals are also subject to the bylaws of the individual programs in which a faculty member may wish to recruit students.

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

Contracts for Clinical Faculty must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, it is expected that Clinical Faculty appointments will be supported by salary recovery from teaching revenue and service line activities, although other sources, including extramural funding may support these appointments.

Clinical faculty may not comprise more than 40% of the number of tenure-track faculty in the Department. In all cases, however, the number of Clinical Faculty must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty.

Clinical Instructor. Appointment to the rank of instructor is made if all the criteria for the position of assistant professor have been met with the exception that the candidate will not have completed the terminal degree, or other relevant training, at the time of the appointment.

When an individual is appointed as an instructor, the letter of offer should indicate the specific benchmarks and accomplishments that will be necessary for promotion to assistant professor.

Instructor appointments are limited to 3 years, with the 3rd year being the terminal year. When an instructor meets the criteria for promotion to assistant professor on the clinical faculty, a new letter of offer with a probationary period of 5 years will be issued.

In the event the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered.

Criteria to be considered for appointment at the rank of Instructor on the clinical faculty track are identical to those described above for Instructor on the tenure track, except the candidate must have:

- Anticipated receipt of an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study.
- Evidence of potential for contributions to education.

Assistant Clinical Professor. Candidates for appointment at this rank are expected to have earned a doctorate, consistent with existing or proposed educational program goals of the Department.

The initial appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary. During a probationary period, a faculty member is considered for reappointment annually. A probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the provision of University Rule [3335-6-08](#) and the provision of paragraphs (B) and (D) of University Rule [3335-7-07](#). An Assistant Clinical Professor may be reviewed for promotion at any time during the probationary period or during a subsequent contract.

Criteria to be considered for appointment at the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor will be identical to those used for tenure-track Assistant Professor, except there is no expectation that the candidate document prior excellence in scholarship or leadership within a productive research program.

Associate Clinical Professor and Clinical Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate clinical professor or clinical professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria for promotion to these ranks (see Section VI in this document).

3. Research Faculty

Research faculty appointments exist for individuals who focus entirely on research. These appointments are intended for individuals who will have faculty level responsibilities in the research mission, comparable to the level of a Co-Investigator. Individuals who serve as laboratory managers or otherwise contribute to the research mission at a level comparable to that of a postdoctoral fellow should not be appointed as Research Faculty, but rather should be appointed as *Research Scientists* (see Appendix A), potentially with associated faculty appointments (postdoctoral fellows are appointed as postdoctoral researchers).

The goals of Research Faculty appointments are career advancement of qualified individuals that currently support shared research facilities (e.g., core labs) or are members of a tenured faculty member's lab in the Department (a Sponsor). Research Faculty appointments may provide the opportunity for individuals to develop their own research programs, including the ability to obtain independent extramural grants and build and/or consolidate a reputation in their chosen area of study (e.g., through invitations to present at national/international meetings, peer review service etc.). The primary duty of Research Faculty is to conduct research. They are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected in high quality peer-reviewed publications.

Research Faculty appointments are fixed term (1-5 year) contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. There is also no presumption that contracts will be renewed, regardless of performance. If the Department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7-07](#).

Contracts must explicitly state expectations for salary support. Research Faculty appointments will require 100% salary recovery that will be derived from extramural research grants, for which either the Research Faculty member or Sponsor will be Principal Investigator. If the latter, the Sponsor must certify to the Department Chair, in writing, that sufficient research grant funds exist to cover the salary over the period of the contract. While salary support for Research Faculty may not come from dollars provided to the Department of Neuroscience by the College of Medicine, if extramural funds are not sufficient to cover all of a Research Faculty's salary, start-up funds and/or Department Chair package funds may be used, temporarily, to maintain the Research Faculty member's salary at 100%. Space made available for Research Faculty will be consistent with the Department, Center, or College Space Policy, which depends on extramural funding.

Research Faculty may, but are not required to, participate in the educational mission of the Department. However, teaching opportunities for each Research Faculty member must first be approved by the Sponsor then approved by a majority vote of the Tenure Track Faculty. Under no circumstances may a member of the Research Faculty be continuously engaged over an extended period in the same instructional activities as Clinical or Tenure-Track Faculty.

Within the Department of Neuroscience, Research Faculty may be appointed at the discretion of the Chair and, if appropriate, after consultation with the Sponsor, to no more

than one standing or ad-hoc committee. Research Faculty may serve on University committees and task forces, but not on University Governance committees.

Research Faculty are eligible to advise and supervise graduate students and postdoctoral trainees and to be a principal investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the graduate school as detailed in Section 12 of the [Graduate School Handbook](#). Approvals are also subject to the bylaws of the individual programs in which a faculty member may wish to recruit students.

Research faculty may not comprise more than 20% of the number of tenure-track faculty in the Department. In all cases, however, the number of Research Faculty must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty.

Tenure is not granted to Research Faculty.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meets criteria identical to those described above for Assistant Professor on the tenure track.

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.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated Faculty, as defined in the *Rules of the University Faculty* [3335-5-19](#) (B)(3), include "persons with practice titles, adjunct titles, visiting titles, returning retirees and lecturer titles." Tenure-track faculty title on an appointment of < 50% FTE also are associated faculty. Members of the associated faculty are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. Associated faculty appointments may be 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. The below titles are used for associated faculty in the College of Medicine.

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

- Have significant and meaningful interaction in at least one of the following mission areas of the Department of Neuroscience:
 - Teaching: undergraduate, graduate and medical students and postdoctoral fellows
 - Research: These faculty members may collaborate with a TIU or division in the College in research projects or other scholarly activities.
 - Service to the Department or the College: This includes participation in committees or other leadership activities (e.g., membership on Graduate Studies Committees).

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. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.

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

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

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

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

5. Returning Retiree

Faculty who have retired from the University and return in any paid appointment at the University are associated faculty. Approvals are only for one year and must cover their salary and associated costs. Reappointment for additional years is possible but the initial and any re-appointment is based on the needs of the unit rather than the desire of the individual, with particular attention to the ways the reappointment can benefit the university. All reemployed retiree faculty appointments must be approved by the Department Chair, Dean and University Office of Academic Affairs. Reemployment as a retiree is not an entitlement.

6. Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department Chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Department Chair may request input from the aAPT Committee regarding Emeritus recommendations. The evaluation for appointment to Emeritus status should encompass the overall contributions of the faculty member to their field of study, to teaching and service, as well as contributions to the Department, College, University and community. The Chair and/or the aAPT Committee may request documentation to facilitate evaluation from the candidate and from any other source deemed appropriate.

The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair, who will then 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.

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the Department of Neuroscience 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. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

Individuals seeking a courtesy appointment in the Department of Neuroscience are expected to make substantive contributions to the Department's overall mission. There are many ways that a courtesy faculty member can contribute to the Department of Neuroscience including:

- Establishing a collaboration with a member of the Department of Neuroscience that results in publications or grant submissions that include both the faculty member with the courtesy appointment and the faculty member for which the Department of Neuroscience is their TIU.

- Develop and teach new courses for the Department of Neuroscience or provide one or more lectures in existing graduate/undergraduate courses that are led by a Department of Neuroscience faculty member.
- Serve on Department of Neuroscience committees (e.g., search committees for new faculty)
- Serve as an active mentor for junior faculty members in the Department of Neuroscience.

The above list is not comprehensive and whether a faculty member is granted or continues to hold a courtesy appointment will ultimately be determined by a vote of the faculty for which the Department of Neuroscience is their TIU. A simple majority vote is required before new courtesy appointments are approved or renewed.

Courtesy appointments will be reviewed every 3 years by the Department. For faculty members that are not meeting the above criteria, their courtesy appointment may be terminated (with notice). As with Associated Faculty, at a minimum, the contribution of Courtesy faculty to the Department of Neuroscience must be assessed on an annual basis and documented for the individual's personnel file. This may take the form of self-evaluation. Neither a formal written review nor a meeting is required.

To request or renew a courtesy appointment in the Department of Neuroscience, faculty should send a brief letter/email to the Department Chair explaining the rationale for a courtesy appointment and projected contribution to the Department.

8. Joint Appointments

These are paid faculty positions with the FTE and salary support shared between the Department of Neuroscience and one or more TIUs. Joint faculty appointments are created to leverage the faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of all the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. These appointments are therefore distinct from courtesy appointments. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) is created by the academic units creating the joint appointment and will clearly define distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the unit in which the faculty member's FTE is >0.5 will be considered the TIU. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units on manuscripts, the manner in which credit for grant funding will be attributed to the different units and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units.

B. Appointment Procedures

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

In addition, see the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

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

The Department Chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the Department. When possible, the committee should be comprised of faculty across all ranks.

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

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

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

ensure alignment with university and unit EEO goals and advance the eminence of the institution.

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

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

If 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.

Any candidate being considered for appointment that requires sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. An [MOU](#) must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2. Clinical Faculty

Initial appointment reviews of Clinical Faculty candidates will be conducted using the same guidelines used for Tenure Track faculty, except that instead of a research presentation, clinical faculty candidates are expected to give a lecture that highlights their didactic teaching skills. Before the Department Chair calls a vote of the eligible faculty regarding appointment of a prospective clinical faculty member, every effort will be made to have the candidate meet with departmental faculty. To facilitate the review of

clinical faculty candidates, the candidate should provide an updated CV and a vision statement to the eligible faculty. A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all clinical faculty positions.

3. Research Faculty

Initial appointment reviews of Research Faculty candidates will be conducted using guidelines as described for Tenure Track faculty. Before the Department Chair calls a vote of the eligible faculty regarding appointment of a prospective research faculty member, every effort will be made to have the candidate meet with departmental faculty and present a research seminar. However, under extenuating circumstances the seminar can be replaced with (1) one-on-one or group meetings between the candidate and a group of eligible faculty, either in person or via phone/internet or (2) a chalk-talk to a group of eligible faculty. To facilitate the review of research faculty candidates, the candidate should provide a research summary statement and an updated CV to the eligible faculty.

4. Transfers: Track and TIU

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

Transfer: Tenure Track to Clinical Faculty. If a faculty member's activities become more aligned with the criteria for appointment to the clinical faculty, they may request a transfer. A transfer request must be approved by the Department Chair, dean, and executive vice president and provost. The first appointment to the clinical faculty is probationary; and tenure, or the possibility thereof, is revoked.

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities.

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

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities.

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

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

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

Approval of the transfer by University OAA is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed upon arrangements between the administrators of the affected TIUs, including the Department Chairs, College dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including University OAA, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

5. Associated Faculty

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

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 eligible faculty.

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

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

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

6. Joint Appointments

Any TIU may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.8. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by University OAA is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed upon arrangement between the administrators of the affected TIUs, including the Department Chairs, College dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including University OAA, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any Department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State TIU. 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 or designee 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

In the Department of Neuroscience, all faculty, regardless of rank or tenure status, will participate in an annual merit review process. 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. The overall goal of the annual merit review is to evaluate a faculty member's contributions to scholarship, teaching and service. The annual merit review cycle must be complete before the end of the University fiscal year (ending June each year). To ensure that merit raise recommendations are available to the College in a timely manner, all faculty review meetings and documentation will be completed using the following timeline:

Mandatory Mentoring Committee Meetings	aAPT Committee Meeting	Meeting with Chair/Merit Review
<i>Sept-Oct</i>	<i>Dec-Jan</i>	<i>Apr-Jun</i>

All clinical faculty, probationary faculty and tenured Associate Professors must complete an annual review with their mentoring committee each year. These meetings will typically occur in Sept-Oct each year (**and not later than Nov 1**). The goal of these meetings is to assess progress of the faculty member toward promotion or promotion and tenure. Mentoring committee expectations are outlined in the Department of Neuroscience *Pattern of Administration* document. To provide their colleagues sufficient notice for scheduling, it is expected that all probationary faculty and Associate Professors will schedule their mentoring committee meetings several weeks in advance of the Nov 1 deadline.

The aAPT committee meets with faculty soon after mentoring committee meetings have concluded, but *no later than January* of the following year (see timeline table above). The aAPT committee reviews all probationary faculty and Associate Professors (regardless of tenure) then provides the faculty member and the Department Chair with a written assessment of a faculty member's current dossier and/or curriculum vitae, all student evaluation of instruction (SEI) reports, peer evaluations, other relevant material including comments contained in the advisory letter from the faculty member's mentoring

committee, and any other material that the faculty member deems relevant. To complete a thorough review, the aAPT committee may also request additional material from each faculty member. Finally, the review must also include examples of how the faculty member has exemplified collegiality or citizenship in the workplace.

The goal of the annual review by the aAPT committee is to recognize areas of accomplishment and to identify areas where improvement is needed. If a probationary faculty member's progress is deemed to be less than satisfactory, the aAPT committee will consider the factors that have contributed to the insufficient progress. Where appropriate, the committee may recommend that the faculty member consider applying for an extension of the probationary period according to the provision of [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03\(D\)](#).

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the Department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.

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

Approximately three months after annual review by the aAPT committee, the Department Chair, or their designee, will conduct an annual review of all faculty to assess his/her/their performance and discuss professional goals. These reviews will usually take place in April-June and will also include a discussion of merit-based recommendations for annual salary raises. All faculty members should prepare documentation as outlined below and detailed in the *Faculty Checklist for Annual Review* (Appendix B). Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review by the required deadline will be ineligible for merit-based increases in that year, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

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

A. Documentation

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide current materials to the Department Chair each year for the annual performance and merit review. These materials will include a current:

- 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*)
- faculty spreadsheet that summarizes annual research, teaching and service activities
- updated curriculum vitae

- a one-page narrative that describes that faculty member’s research output and impact, research funding, teaching and service activities for the year in review

In general, these documents should cover a faculty member’s progress from the date of their last annual review meeting to the current review period. The primary goal of the narrative is to capture important facts and subtleties that cannot be captured with numbers in a spreadsheet. However, the narrative should also include immediate or near-term goals in each mission area and a brief description of how the faculty member has exemplified collegiality and citizenship within and beyond the Department (e.g., participation in faculty governance, respect for others time and efforts, outreach activities, and other specific examples of a faculty member’s actions that have effectively contributed to exemplary scholarship, teaching and service).

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. Annual Review Procedures - Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

The following is an example workflow for the annual review process for probationary tenure-track faculty:

- After completing the review with the aAPT committee, faculty are to submit review materials to the Department Chair. Materials to be submitted are outlined above (see “A. Documentation”) and also in the “*Faculty Checklist for Annual Review*” (see Appendix B). A secure folder is available (e.g., OneDrive) for each faculty member so that materials can be uploaded promptly. Materials should be uploaded no later than a deadline to be specified in writing (but typically no later than March 1).
- The Department Chair will review materials then, based on these materials and feedback from the aAPT committee, will prepare a written evaluation of progress-to-date. If appropriate, the same letter will include a recommendation on whether to renew a probationary appointment. Every effort will be made to provide each faculty member with a draft annual review letter in advance of their scheduled review meeting.
- The annual review letter will be discussed in person in a one-on-one meeting between the faculty member and the Department Chair (c. *April-June*).
- Annual review letters will be revised after discussion with the faculty member and will include final ratings (0-3; see *Salary Recommendations* below, also see Appendices D, E, and F) for the faculty member’s performance in each category of *research output*, *research impact*, *research funding*, *teaching and service*. These scores will be the primary metrics used to determine merit salary raises (if applicable).
- Revised letters will be returned to faculty for signatures. These letters represent final letters for that annual review cycle.
- A final written evaluation of annual performance must be signed by both the faculty member and Department Chair (or designee) then the letter is forwarded to the College for review.

Discussion with the chair during the annual review meeting will focus on research, teaching, and service activities in the current year, but to ensure that trends in productivity, or lack thereof, are not overlooked, the discussion may also include activities in previous years (going back 1-2 years) and prior comments from the aAPT Committee. The annual review may also include a discussion of current space assignments relative to amount of funded research programs, direct

appointment salary recovery, collegiality and citizenship, and appropriate alignment of time commitments across the research, teaching and service mission areas.

Probationary faculty whose annual review indicates a low probability of ultimately meeting expectations for promotion and tenure will be so advised by the Department Chair, and a recommendation for non-renewal of the appointment will be made. If the 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 College of Medicine Dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth-Year Review

Each faculty member in the fourth year of probationary appointment must undergo a review utilizing the same process as the review for promotion and tenure, with two exceptions: external letters of evaluation are not required, and the Dean of the College (not the Department Chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. In addition, review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee is not mandatory. The objective of the Fourth-Year Review is to determine if adequate progress towards the achievement of promotion and tenure is being made by the candidate.

In the Department of Neuroscience, the Fourth-Year Review requires that the aAPT Committee present the case of the probationary faculty, pro and con, to the *Eligible Faculty* in the Department (see Section III.A of this document).

External evaluations are only solicited when either the Department Chair or the Eligible Faculty determine that they are needed 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.

After the meeting of the Eligible Faculty, a report of the faculty assessment, prepared by the Chair of the aAPT Committee, including the numerical vote, obtained by secret ballot, is forwarded to the Department Chair who then prepares an independent written assessment of the case and a recommendation to the Dean of the College. At the conclusion of the department's 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. Specifically, the report of the faculty assessment and the Department Chair's letter will be made available to the candidate, who may respond in writing. The chair of the aAPT Committee and/or the Department Chair may provide a written response to any comments made by the candidate for inclusion in the packet that is sent to the Dean. In all cases, the dean or their designee independently evaluates all faculty in their fourth year of probationary appointment and will provide the Department Chair with a written evaluation of the candidate's progress.

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(E\)](#)

does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the Department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C. Annual Review Procedures - Tenured Faculty

The annual review of tenured associate professors will follow all procedures outlined above.

The annual review of tenured professors will follow all procedures outlined above with the exception that they will not meet with a mentoring committee or the aAPT committee.

The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence and ongoing outcomes in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the Department, as demonstrated by ongoing national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, mentoring students or junior faculty, and ongoing outstanding service to the Department, the university, the community and their profession, including their support for the mentoring and 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 citizenship, leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. As such, there is an expectation that a professor's annual participation in departmental programs, as well as baseline productivity metrics, will exceed those of probationary faculty.

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

D. Annual Review Procedures - Clinical Faculty

The annual review process for clinical probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively, except that annual accomplishments in teaching and mentoring will be the primary factors considered during the annual review process. Service and scholarship activities also will be considered and meritorious activity in one or both mission areas could result in higher merit scores (see Appendix G).

In the penultimate year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine if the faculty member will be offered reappointment. The reappointment review during the probationary period (i.e. initial term) requires both an OAA dossier outline and a complete CV which is reviewed by the committee of Eligible Faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed. If a clinical faculty member was reappointed after a formal review process during the initial probationary term (initial contract), all future reappointment decisions can be made by the Department Chair, without the need for formal review by the Eligible Faculty.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Research Faculty

The annual review process for probationary and non-probationary research faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively. Accountability for the annual review process resides with the Department Chair (or designee).

In the penultimate year of a research faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine if the faculty member will be offered reappointment. The reappointment review during the probationary period (i.e. initial term) requires both an OAA dossier outline and a complete CV which is reviewed by the committee of eligible faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

All future reappointment decisions can be made by the Department Chair, without the need for formal review by the eligible faculty.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

F. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members must be reviewed annually before reappointment. The Department Chair (or designee), prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, collegiality, future plans, and goals. The Department Chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

For non-compensated associated faculty members, at a minimum, their contribution to the Department must be assessed on an annual basis and documented for the individual's personnel file. This may take the form of self-evaluation. Neither a formal written review nor a meeting is required.

G. Salary Recommendations

The Department Chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review.

Productivity is the primary factor in determining salary and merit raises. Meritorious performance in scholarship (two separate categories - research output & impact, and research funding), teaching and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions (*also see above, Annual Review Procedures*). The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 24 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance across all mission areas and a pattern of consistent professional growth will be viewed positively. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more core areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Each year, the following rating scale will be used to score a faculty member's performance against established baselines (see Appendices D, E, F, and G) for research output, research impact, research funding, teaching and service. There is an expectation that the productivity metrics of a tenured or non-probationary tenure-track, clinical or research faculty member, as well as their annual participation in departmental programs, will exceed those of any probationary faculty member. The Department Chair will weigh scores accordingly.

- 0.0 – No significant activity in mission area
- 1.0 – Productivity below expectations
- 1.5 – Meets expectations with room for improvement
- 2.0 – Meets expectations
- 2.5 – Meets expectations with some demonstration of excellence
- 3.0 – Exceeds expectations

Although overall performance across the three mission areas will carry the most weight when determining final salary and merit raises, the Department Chair will also consider each faculty member's collegiality and citizenship. As outlined above, a faculty member's narrative description of how they have exemplified collegiality and citizenship within and beyond the Department (e.g., participation in faculty governance, respect for others' time and efforts, outreach activities, and other specific examples of a faculty member's actions that have effectively contributed to exemplary scholarship, teaching and service) is an important criterion in the overall annual review process. The chair may also use other criteria in assessing collegiality and citizenship including attendance and participation in departmental events or programs.

After taking into consideration the unique workload of the individual faculty member and their academic rank, salary and merit raises (if any) will be based on a composite ranking across these mission areas (see below) and collegiality and citizenship (see above).

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Outlined below, in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-6-02\(E\)](#) are the formal criteria for academic advancement, including promotion in each faculty category and awarding of tenure in the Department of Neuroscience.

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 department 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. However, 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 role is and will continue to be research, then convincing evidence of excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated *by a national level of impact and recognition of scholarship and dissemination of new knowledge is required*. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in mission areas that are significantly smaller parts of a candidate's responsibilities.

Excellence in scholarship, teaching, 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](#).

a. Scholarship

Demonstration of national recognition and impact for a program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to associate professor and the award of tenure. Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure occurs when a faculty member exhibits clear and sustained evidence of excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and demonstrated impact in one's field of endeavor. Such endeavors might include laboratory investigation, development of innovative programs, theoretical insight, innovative interpretation of an existing body of knowledge, clinical science, team science, quality improvement, public health and community research, implementation science, among many potential others. While individual circumstances may vary, both the quantity and quality of publications should be considered. Metrics that are useful in assessing a candidate's record of scholarship include but are not limited to the total number of publications since their appointment as an assistant professor, the number of citations of their publications, the trajectory of the publication and/or citation record, and the relative proportion of first/senior or indispensable co-authorships.

Several indicators of scholarship excellence and impact will be used by the Eligible Faculty during their evaluation of a candidate's dossier including:

- ***Achievement of National Recognition and Scientific Impact.*** Several measures will be considered as evidence of having scientific impact:
 - consistent publication as first or senior author in journals that are deemed by experts in the field to be of excellent quality with rigorous review criteria
 - citation rates (the number of times a paper has been cited by other publications)
 - the candidate's h-index, i10 index, iCite ratio or other publication/citation metrics
 - invitations to speak at national and international meetings (in-person or virtual)
 - appointment to editorial boards

- invitations to write review articles
- participation on steering, guideline, or advisory committees of national organizations
- invitations to serve on grant review panels
- receipt of national scientific awards.

Although invitations to speak, write or participate in service activities are measures of recognition and each invitation could signify the emergence of a national reputation, without accepting most of these invitations, this growing reputation is likely to falter and the overall impact of the candidate's scholarship will be stunted. Thus, invitations should be considered as "potential indicators of impact" but not impact *per se*. Similarly, journal impact factor does not necessarily reflect the impact or quality of a candidate's scholarship. Journal impact factor can be a measure of the *average* impact of articles, but the metric is subject to influence by other unrelated factors and is also prone to manipulation. In particular, journal impact factor is generally highly skewed by a small number of highly cited articles and is not a measure of the impact of any given article in that journal. As such, publishing a single paper in one of the highest impact journals (e.g., *Nature*, *Science*, etc.) does not guarantee that a candidate's dossier will be favorably reviewed for promotion and tenure. The relative impact of the candidate's published research, not the journal in which they publish their research, is the single most important criterion for promotion. Although journal impact factor will be acknowledged and considered during review of the candidate's dossier, other measures of impact including number of citations, h-index, i10 index, NIH relative citation ratio (RCR) will be prioritized during review.

The overall impact of scholarship is more important than meeting the minimum number of recommended publications (see below). Indeed, candidates should not assume that their dossier will be considered favorably for promotion and tenure once they have reached a certain number of publications unless the impact of those publications is evident.

- **Letters from external evaluators.** These should be from senior scientists, normally at or above the rank of Associate Professor, that are familiar with the candidate's field(s) of research and who are qualified to assess the importance and quality of their research program and the impact of their published results.
- **Publications.** Publications represent the archival results of the faculty member's research program, both before and since their appointment in the Department, and they play a critical role in promotion and tenure review. If a former mentor is retained as an author on the candidate's papers beyond the first 2 years of faculty appointment, the reason must be clearly stated and the relative contributions must be detailed; otherwise, it will be difficult to determine if the candidate was able to develop an independent scientific career.

Candidates for promotion to associate professor will ideally have 10-15 peer-reviewed publications since their appointment as an assistant professor. The 10-15 publication metric equates to, on average, 2 publications every year from the date of appointment to the tenure-track and is in line with the baseline metrics described above for Annual Review/Merit Salary Increases. Note, although numbers of publications are intended as general guidelines, it is expected that faculty will be on a trajectory to meet or exceed these numbers at the time of promotion and the pattern of scholarship since

appointment at Ohio State will include an increasing proportion of publications as first, senior or corresponding author. These papers should be published in recognized, peer-reviewed journals. The relative importance of other authorship positions as a key/indispensable contributor will also be considered, but most of the faculty member's publications since joining Ohio State as a faculty member are expected to be independent research publications arising from work primarily conducted in the candidate's laboratory, with the candidate as senior or corresponding author.

Book chapters and/or review articles may form a portion of the publication list; however, a successful dossier will contain mostly (>80%) peer-reviewed research articles based on novel research data generated in the candidate's laboratory. Book chapters or reviews alone or in majority are not sufficient for promotion, even if they were peer-reviewed.

During review of the candidate's dossier, their publication citation rate will be documented and verified by the Procedures Oversight Designee; the dossier, prepared by the candidate, will contain a citation table that indicates the number of citations for individual papers published at The Ohio State University and an overall career citation index. It is recognized that the citation rate for papers published within 1 or 2 years before review for Promotion and Tenure is initiated may be low due to the short time the work has been available. However, evidence that the work is well-received would be supportive of the impact of the work, and would commonly be documented in external letters of evaluation and by other common publicizing vehicles including high Altmetric scores, conventional media coverage, Editorial highlights, social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics, etc.

If the Committee of Eligible Faculty and the candidate's professional peers do not consider the candidate's research to be of high quality or impact, scholarship that exceeds the publishing guidelines outlined above does not guarantee a positive promotion and tenure recommendation. Thus, it is not advisable to publish the smallest quanta of data to enhance publication numbers. Similarly, it should be appreciated that scholarship exceeding the range specified above is not a guarantee of a positive tenure or promotion decision, especially if it occurs in isolation or in the context of performance that is below expectations in other mission areas. Moreover, it is possible that publication numbers below recommended ranges could still result in a positive promotion and tenure review if evidence can be presented that the candidate's independent research program is having a strong impact (see above for guidelines for demonstrating impact).

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion and tenure decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements while a faculty member at The Ohio State University. Overall, the publication history being reviewed for awarding of promotion and tenure should be of sufficient *quantity and quality* to allow unequivocal determination that a faculty member has influenced (impacted) discovery of new knowledge in their field and has proved an ability to effectively communicate their data to the scientific community. *Thus, quality and impact are the most important criteria for promotion, but quantity is also important.*

- Research funding.** Faculty are expected to support their independent research programs and to obtain salary recovery that meets or exceeds the obligations defined in their most recent Ohio State contract. Evidence of sustained or multiple grant support is another crucial indicator of expertise in the field. Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must have obtained significant, multi-year funding from the NIH, NSF or other nationally competitive peer-reviewed funding sources. The standard by which all research funding is measured is the NIH investigator-initiated R01. Obtaining NIH R01 funding as a principal investigator (PI) is key to success; however, securing research funding as a program director or principal investigator on a larger NIH (multiple-PD/PI) (i.e., multicenter R01 or equivalent such as a project on a P01, U54), or National Science Foundation (NSF) grant, or having obtained a mid-career K award may also satisfy expectations for research funding. Other nationally competitive, peer reviewed funding sources recognized by the Department of Neuroscience include prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., American Heart Association, American Diabetes Association, American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, the March of Dimes, Craig H. Neilsen Foundation, etc.), industry grants, or large grants from other federal entities such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Department of Defense. Evidence for a sustained record of funding from these types of agencies but without NIH R01 funding could still satisfy the criterion for obtaining nationally competitive peer reviewed funding, if the record of funding meets or exceeds the obligations defined in the candidate's most recent Ohio State contract. Similarly, faculty members who generate support for their research programs through investigator-initiated grants or contracts from pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies, creation of spin-off companies or as a co-investigator, co- principal investigator, or other comparable role on collaborative grants may also meet the criteria for extramural funding. Since the principal reason for obtaining research support is to allow the work to progress, the key is providing unequivocal evidence for sustainability of funding to support a candidate's research program. Therefore, the final arbiter of research success is not the amount of funding, but the quality and impact of the research program and its archival publications.
- Research independence and collaboration.** Faculty are expected to develop *independent* research programs, but research collaboration is encouraged as it is an important means for attaining new knowledge and securing funds to support a research program's growth and sustainability. Because junior faculty who are just initiating their careers may not have enough students and postdoctoral fellows in their laboratories to assist in conducting experiments, they are encouraged to develop collaborations. Fruitful collaborations usually involve important and recognizable contributions from each of the collaborators. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued, especially to the extent that a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, co-corresponding or corresponding author. When a faculty member's collaborative scholarship results primarily in middle authorship, the recognition and impact of their scholarship must be reflected through other indicators such as, but not limited to, the indispensability of the candidate's role and contribution in generating the publication(s), invitations to serve on editorial boards, study sections, national invitations to speak, etc. Further, it is important for candidates to identify how the collaboration relates to the candidate's independent research program.
- Innovation and entrepreneurship.** Innovation and entrepreneurship that impact society are special forms of valued scholarship. Entrepreneurship includes patents and licenses

of invention disclosures, software development, and materials transfers technology and commercialization. Innovation can be demonstrated by designing and/or supervising the construction of creative products (e.g., new technologies, devices, software, algorithms) which advance health-related science and healthcare, by developing and securing intellectual property such as patents, patent disclosures and licensing of university-developed intellectual property; by commercializing intellectual property through innovation and entrepreneurial activities such as entity creation, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements; by engaging in reciprocal partnership with the community, involving mutually beneficial exchanges of knowledge and the creation, delivery and assessment of timely, unbiased, educational materials and programs that address relevant, critical and emerging issues. Inasmuch as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, the Department and the College of Medicine will analyze these flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceedings, patents will be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenue will be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities will be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly activities in the promotion and tenure dossier.

Demonstration of national recognition and impact for a program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to associate professor and the award of tenure.

b. Teaching

A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion and tenure. Teaching is defined as didactic lecturing and other means of communicating knowledge of neuroscience to students at the high school (e.g., summer camps, internships), undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral and post-graduate levels. The departmental teaching mission includes primarily undergraduate teaching (lectures, laboratory, and independent study), professional teaching (medical), graduate and post-doctoral teaching (didactic and laboratory instruction), advising, and mentoring.

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires a distinctive record of teaching and mentoring excellence and effectiveness. Teaching excellence is most commonly demonstrated through student and peer evaluations. Teaching awards and other honors are also indicators of teaching excellence. Teaching effectiveness may be reflected by documented impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities such as web-based design, mobile application, virtual teaching, or methods of evaluating teaching, program or course development, publications on teaching, and societal leadership in education. Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching and research are valued. Programs that improve cultural competence are particularly valued.

Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. Voluntary teaching (seminars, interdisciplinary teaching, invited presentations, CME, etc.) will also be considered.

Some courses taught by this Department involve team teaching. The evaluations of peers involved in team taught courses is a valuable addition to the teaching portion of

the dossier. Evaluations by the course director also are important criteria for judging teaching effectiveness.

All faculty are encouraged to participate in the [Teaching Support Program](#) offered through the University's Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning. This program is available to tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty and lecturers.

Evaluations and review of teaching: Both student and peer evaluations are required for promotion and tenure. Information about student evaluations can be obtained by accessing the [Student Evaluation of Instruction \(SEI\)](#). To be consistent with the College of Medicine guidelines, members of the probationary faculty member's mentoring committee, along with members of the Peer Evaluation of Teaching Committee (see below), are expected to review:

- 1.) the teaching of probationary tenure track and probationary clinical faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- 2.) the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate clinical professors at least once per year.
- 3.) the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary clinical professors at least once every two years.

Faculty members should make their mentors aware of when lectures are to be given and ask them to attend for the purpose of providing a peer evaluation. Another form of peer review may be derived from evaluation letters written by Course Directors or other team members in team-taught courses. A standardized peer evaluation form, specifically created to evaluate faculty within the Department of Neuroscience, should be used for all peer-evaluation of teaching. Other documentation of teaching may include an administrator's (e.g., Department Chair) assessment of the candidate's teaching load, contribution to the teaching mission of the academic unit, and contribution to curriculum development.

Finally, a candidate should provide a self-evaluation of teaching, as evidence of teaching quality. This self-evaluation should be part of the narrative associated with teaching in the core dossier and should include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching, self-assessment, interpretation of students' and peers' evaluations, and description of specific strategies undertaken for improvement.

Additional documentation of effective graduate teaching may include the productivity and employment of former students, participation on graduate examination committees and honors committees for undergraduates. Any other efforts that can be documented as enhancing student learning experiences also will be considered.

c. Service

Service is defined as supportive activities that contribute to the operation of the Department, College, University and the enhancement of the profession. National and international service provides evidence that the faculty member is contributing to the advancement of the profession and the goals of the Department and university. Local

service includes administrative and committee work for the Department, College and University. National or international service to the profession includes editorial service to scholarly publications, peer review assignments, consulting, professional society service, organizing meetings or symposia. In addition, relevant community service, such as giving presentations at local schools or serving as a judge for regional Science Fairs for middle and high school students will be considered as service.

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires a distinctive record of service. Evidence of distinctive service will include specific examples of both local and national service activity, including serving as an editorial referee for high quality professional journals in the candidate's discipline, service in major professional societies in the faculty's field of research, invitations to consult or review grants for federal agencies and private foundations and receiving awards for service contributions.

Candidates can consider demonstrating impact of their service work by utilization of social and traditional media (such as X (formerly Twitter), Facebook, Instagram, radio, television, podcasts, etc.) to promote community engagement, advocacy and awareness. Similarly, innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as design and implementation of a novel program to reduce race or gender-based discrimination within the Department, College, University or beyond, can be considered service activities. It is expected that candidates show evidence of College values in their service activities [See Appendix D in the [College of Medicine APT document](#)].

Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

2. Promotion to Professor

Awarding promotion to the rank of professor with tenure must be based upon convincing, unequivocal evidence that the candidate has a sustained eminence in their field with evidence of national leadership in their area of research and/or international recognition and impact. The general criteria for promotion in scholarship, teaching and service require more advanced and sustained quantity, quality and impact than that required for promotion to associate professor. Importantly, the standard for external reputation is substantially more rigorous than for promotion to associate professor with tenure. This record of excellence must be evident from activities undertaken and accomplishments achieved since being appointed or promoted to the rank of associate professor. Demonstration of sustained national leadership in their area of research and/or international recognition and impact are essential requirements for promotion to professor. It is expected that the faculty member will have a consistent record of high-quality publications with demonstrated impact well beyond that required for promotion to associate professor. Faculty being promoted to professor should exhibit professionalism, positive values and foster a safe and collaborative work environment.

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 sustained impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the Department, College and University.

a. Scholarship

Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. Enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity and a sustained record of external funding since promotion to associate professor is required for promotion to professor.

- ***Publications.*** A candidate for promotion to professor will typically have published 15-25 papers since their promotion to Associate Professor. It is expected that the pattern of scholarship will include mostly publications as senior or corresponding author since promotion to associate professor. Total number of publications will vary for individuals depending on their specific sub-discipline and the journals that they target for publication. A further evaluation will include analysis of the number of citations to individual papers, whether there is a consistent increase in annual citations to published articles and an overall assessment of the number of citations to the candidate's body of work. Evidence that the candidate for promotion has been instrumental in the research and writing of the publications should be provided by an annotated bibliography that indicates the individual's contributions to each work. Overall, demonstrated impact of scholarship is more important than meeting the minimum number of recommended publications. Impact is as defined above for promotion to Associate Professor but, the criteria for promotion to Professor requires that the demonstrated impact of a candidate's scholarship is more advanced and has been sustained year-over-year since promotion to Associate Professor.
- ***Research funding.*** Candidates for promotion to Professor will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program including sustained funding. At a minimum, candidates for promotion to professor must be a PI or multi-PD/PI on at least one NIH R01 or equivalent grant (e.g. but not limited to NSF, DoD, USDA, AHRQ, DARPA, RWJF, Commonwealth Fund, Kaiser Family Foundation, etc.) with a history of at least one competitive renewal and other nationally competitive grants, or have simultaneous funding on two or more awards with support equivalent to two NIH R01 awards. This may include support from prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., American Heart Association, American Diabetes Association, American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, the March of Dimes, Craig H. Neilsen Foundation, etc.), industry (e.g., biotechnology firms, pharmaceutical companies), or other federal entities such as the Department of Defense and the National Science Foundation. In some circumstances, (e.g., specific techniques) a faculty member's expertise may not justify PI-level status. In these cases, serving as a co-investigator on multiple NIH grants may satisfy the requirement for extramural funding. Consistent funding of a research program by national agencies is taken as evidence of continued productivity and contribution to the field.

Additional criteria that will be evaluated by the aAPT committee and that is essential for promotion to professor includes unequivocal evidence that the candidate's research reputation is well-recognized and that they are viewed by peers as an important participant or leader in their research community. The candidate should have played a national leadership role and/or attained international recognition for their research. Such evidence should include having served as a national committee or task force chair, chair of an NIH or other federal review panel, been a regular (permanent) member on an NIH study section, received peer recognition or awards for research, been named to editorial boards or as an editor of one or more scientific journals, consistently provided invited lectures at universities and especially at international institutions and scientific meetings, been responsible as an organizer of scientific meetings, provided consistent critical expert reviews on a research topic for scientific journals, been invited to consult with government agencies, private foundations or companies on a scientific topic. External evaluators' comments can also contribute to these various indices of reputation. Indeed, letters of evaluation will be sought from external evaluators. These letters should be from senior scientists, normally Professors, who are familiar with research in the candidate's field(s) of research who are qualified to assess the importance and quality of the candidate's overall research program. The guidelines for soliciting these letters are the same as described for obtaining external letters of evaluation for Associate Professor. National and/or international reputation/impact may also be demonstrated, in part, through non-traditional metrics (e.g. social media portfolios, Altmetrics scores).

b. Teaching and Mentoring

A continued strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion to Professor. Evidence may include but is not limited to outstanding student, resident, fellow, local colleague, and/or national peer evaluations, course or workshop leadership and design, a training program directorship, teaching awards, and organization of national course and curricula or participation in specialty boards. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

Effective mentorship of junior faculty is expected for candidates for promotion to professor. It is presumed this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship and not just *ad hoc* career coaching (e.g., casual conversations). Candidates should provide evidence of the effectiveness and impact of their mentorship.

c. Service

Promotion to the rank of professor requires service excellence to the Department, the College of Medicine, the university, and to national and international professional societies. Evidence of excellence in this latter area will include: service as an editor for a book or scientific journal, appointments to editorial boards and editorships for high quality professional journals in the candidate's discipline, leadership roles and elected offices in major professional societies in the faculty's field, invitations to consult or review grants, appointments to grant review boards for federal agencies and private foundations, and awards for service contribution. While exemplary service and emergence of leadership activities at the national and international level greatly enhances the case for promotion to Professor, this service should be supplemented with

service excellence to the department and/or university.[See Appendix D of the [College of Medicine APT document](#)].

3. Clinical Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor. For promotion to assistant clinical professor (from Clinical-Instructor), a faculty member must complete his/her/their doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in his/her/their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, and service as defined by terms in their initial probationary contract. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

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

First and foremost, promotion to Clinical Associate Professor requires evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition related to the primary focus of this pathway (didactic education) since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor. Excellence in scholarship or professional service is also important and will be considered; however, excellence in both service *and* scholarship is not required for promotion to Associate Professor. Excellence is defined here as the attainment of high standards of quality and sufficient quantity of activities to constitute a substantial contribution to the community, Department, College and University. The relative impact of the faculty member's teaching/educational activities is the single most important criterion for promotion. The clinical-educator pathway may reflect effectiveness as an educator of trainees at any level, including educating colleagues and peers.

a. Teaching and Mentoring

A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring *is required* for promotion. Effectiveness may be measured by various metrics including, but not limited to curriculum/web-based design and implementation, innovative teaching practices, modules, and publications. Consistently positive teaching evaluations by students, trainees, and peers are required. Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members. Effectiveness may also be reflected by teaching awards or other honors. Clinical faculty may also demonstrate national impact through invitations to serve as faculty on national continuing medical education programs or societal leadership in education or other national activities. In all cases, evidence of improved educational processes or outcomes (i.e., impact) is required. Participating in programs focused on pedagogy of teaching (e.g., sponsored by FAME or other outside programs).

b. Service

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University; program development relating to administrative, leadership and related activities; professional service to the faculty member's discipline; and the provision of professional expertise to

public and private entities beyond the University. Professional service could include, but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, service on editorial boards, service to the community as pertains to the candidate's specialty, development of innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as creation and sustenance of a program that educates the community, and leadership positions in professional societies.

c. Scholarship

The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed journal publications focused on the pedagogy of education. Examples include papers regarding innovative teaching techniques, scholarly review articles and book chapters focused on education theory, new curricula and methods of evaluation. Some Clinical faculty may publish works based on specific areas of research expertise which may or may not form the basis for their teaching of colleagues and peers. These may include, but are not limited to review papers, book chapters as well as original investigator-initiated studies related to their area of research training. Development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are considered published works. Social media portfolios, such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics may also be considered; however, these non-traditional metrics do not, in and of themselves, demonstrate the impact of the candidate's scholarship. In the current era of team and collaborative scholarship, it is recognized that meaningful scholarship is not uniformly represented by first or senior authorship. Works in which the faculty member's individual and identifiable expertise was essential to the publication are regarded as having merit equivalent to those that are first or senior author. A range of 10-15 scholarly written or digital publications of this type since appointment as an assistant professor is suggested as a scope of work consistent with promotion to associate professor. However, this range does not represent an inflexible requirement for promotion.

Promotion to Clinical Professor. The awarding of promotion to the rank of professor on the clinical faculty, clinical educator pathway, must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of *leadership* or *international recognition* since appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor. Evidence of international recognition or national leadership should be related to the primary focus of the pathway (i.e., didactic education). Excellence in scholarship activities and professional service will also be considered and should be more advanced with sustained quantity, quality and impact relative to these same requirements for promotion to associate professor. Excellence is not required in all domains.

a. Teaching and Mentoring

A documented record of sustained teaching and mentoring excellence is required for promotion. Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their teaching and mentoring. Sustained positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and/or national peers are required. Multiple teaching awards and other honors are indicative of this level of teaching excellence but are not required. Candidates must demonstrate favorable impact on teaching and training programs, such as curriculum/web-based innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and/or program or course development. Other examples include the development of multiple impactful,

innovative programs that integrate teaching research and patient care or incorporating social and digital media-based education.

Teaching excellence may also be demonstrated through committee appointments in national education committees such as Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, National Medical Association, American Association of Higher Education, Association of American Colleges and Universities or Association of American Medical Colleges, including specialty boards or professional societies at the national level.

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

b. Service

Service to the institution and profession is an expectation for promotion to professor. Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, program development relating to administrative, leadership and related activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Professional service could include, but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, service on editorial boards, development of innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, and leadership positions in professional societies. In addition, invitations to serve as external evaluators for promotion candidates from peer institutions is a reflection of a national reputation. Candidates can consider demonstrating national and/or international impact of their work by utilization of social and traditional media (such as, but not limited to, X (formerly Twitter), Facebook, Instagram, radio, television, podcasts) to promote community engagement advocacy and awareness.

c. Scholarship

The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed journal publications. Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their scholarship. Faculty in the clinical educator pathway may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain. Examples include papers regarding innovative teaching techniques, scholarly review articles and book chapters focused on education theory, new curricula, methods of evaluation and social media portfolios (e.g., blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties) or professional media engagement focused on scholarly topics. However, these non-traditional metrics do not in and of themselves demonstrate the impact of research. Alternatively, other faculty members in the clinical educator pathway may publish works based on their areas of research expertise, which may or may not form the basis for their teaching of colleagues and peers. These may include, but are not limited to, review papers, book chapters as well as original investigator-initiated studies related to their area of expertise.

Development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are published works. In the current era of team science and collaborative scholarship, it is recognized that meaningful scholarship is not uniformly represented by first or senior authorship. Works in which the faculty member's individual and identifiable expertise was essential to the publication are regarded as having merit equivalent to those that are first or senior author. A range of 10-15 scholarly written or digital publications since appointment or promotion to associate professor is suggested as a scope of work

consistent with promotion to professor. However, this range does not represent an inflexible requirement for promotion.

4. Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. Candidates for promotion to research associate professor are expected to demonstrate the beginnings of national recognition of their expertise. This may be reflected by (but not limited to) invitations to review manuscripts or grant applications, invitations to lecture at scientific societies or other universities, consultation with industry or governmental agencies, requests for collaboration from other universities, request to serve in central roles on multi-center studies, etc. National reputation/impact may also be demonstrated in part through non-traditional metrics (e.g. social media portfolios, Altmetrics scores).

Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research. Promotion to associate professor requires documentation of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship based upon their expertise. Candidates typically should have 15-20 peer reviewed journal publications since their appointment as research assistant professors. First, senior, or corresponding authorships are typically not expected; however, a faculty member should demonstrate their critical role to a given project. This may include critical method development, training and oversight (mentoring) of junior lab members, and/or conceptualization and execution of the project. Overall, the number of publications required for promotion should be sufficient to persuasively characterize the faculty member's influence in helping to discover new knowledge in their field. Thus, both quality and quantity are important considerations. It should be appreciated that scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive promotion decision. Similarly, records of scholarship below the specified range do not preclude a positive promotion decision.

Research faculty being promoted to associate professor are expected to demonstrate commitment to College and University values, and should exhibit professionalism and foster a safe and collaborative work environment.

It is expected that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of full direct salary appointment to one or more extramural funding sources (i.e., 100% salary recovery). Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators (i.e., essential personnel), and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigator) is not required.

Promotion to Research Professor. The awarding of promotion to the rank of research professor must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has established a national level of recognition and impact beyond that which was established for promotion to associate professor. This may be reflected by (but not limited to) invitations to review manuscripts or grant applications outside the university (e.g., NIH, NSF, private foundations, etc.), invitations to lecture at scientific societies or other universities, consultation with industry or governmental agencies, requests for collaboration from other universities, requests to serve in central roles on multi-center studies, etc. National reputation/impact may also be demonstrated in part through non-traditional metrics (e.g. social media portfolios, Altmetrics scores).

Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research. Promotion to professor requires documented evidence of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship. Candidates should have 20-30 peer reviewed journal publications since their appointment as research associate professor. Some first, senior, or corresponding authorships are expected. Alternatively, the candidate should document a supportive role to the project. Overall, the number of publications required for promotion should be sufficient to persuasively characterize the faculty member's influence in helping to discover new knowledge in their field. Thus, both quality and quantity are important considerations. It should be appreciated that scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive promotion decision. Similarly, records of scholarship below the specified range do not preclude a positive promotion decision.

Research faculty being promoted to professor are expected to demonstrate commitment to College and University values and should exhibit positive values and foster a safe and collaborative work environment.

It is expected that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of full direct salary appointment to one or more extramural funding sources (i.e., 100% salary recovery). Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators (i.e., essential personnel), and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigator) is not required.

5. Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

B. Procedures

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

1. Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty

a. Candidate Responsibilities

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

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

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

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, 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 or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

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

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, 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 or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Documentation. Faculty members preparing their dossiers for promotion and/or tenure review should consult Volume 3 of OAA's [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) to ensure that all required documentation is included. The following paragraphs provide suggested standards for documenting excellence in Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service.

a. Teaching

Teaching is defined as imparting knowledge, experience, insight, and skill to other persons. In the College of Medicine, teaching must be consistently effective and of high quality.

All Tenure Track and Clinical faculty in the College of Medicine must be engaged in teaching, development of the Department's and College's academic programs, and mentoring of students, residents and fellows. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated by documentation of teaching activities over a sustained period of time.

Specific guidelines for documenting and assessing the quality and effectiveness of each faculty member as a teacher are outlined earlier in this document. Evidence for effective teaching may be collected from multiple different sources including students, residents, peers, self-evaluation and administrators.

Yearly, student evaluations and peer evaluations, at a minimum, are required. Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated by positive evaluations from learners (students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and national peers). Within the Department of Neuroscience we have established a standard methodology and assessment tool for teacher evaluation by peers. Student evaluation of instruction (SEI) of faculty will be evaluated using the University SEIs. Faculty members may supplement these required assessment tools with others if they wish. Learners must be provided an opportunity to assess the instructor and course using the required assessment tool in every regular classroom course. Regardless of the instructional setting, effort should be made to obtain evaluations from the largest number of learners as possible. When there is a significant discrepancy between the number of learners enrolled and the number providing evaluations, the evaluations cannot be assumed to represent a consensus of student opinion.

Typically, documentation of teaching for the promotion dossier will include:

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every formal class
- Medical student evaluations (e.g., Vitals)
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the Department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details outlined below in Section IX. B.)
- In team-taught courses, a Qualtrics survey has been set-up for each participating faculty member. Students are asked to evaluate the lecture at the time it is presented. For team-taught courses, this survey is to be used in place of standard SEIs.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other Colleges or Universities
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members. Peer evaluations may include internal, and/or external review of classroom instruction,

clinical teaching and course materials such as syllabi, examinations and instructional materials including textbooks.

Assessment by observation of classroom teaching is most useful when done systematically over time and conducted with the specific goal of offering constructive suggestions.

Responsibility for arranging for peer review activities rests with the faculty member whose teaching or teaching materials are to be reviewed. Specifically, that faculty member will request a peer evaluation from the Department's Peer Review of Teaching committee (see also below).

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

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

b. Scholarship

Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge by research, study and learning. In the College of Medicine, a faculty member's scholarship must be demonstrated to be of high quality, significance and impact. In this document (above) are clear guidelines for how to document and assess the quality and significance of a faculty member's scholarship.

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

Scholarship is broadly defined including all aspects of basic science, clinical research including clinical trials and research based on cases or case series, educational outcomes research, development of academic modules, entrepreneurship. New and emerging methods of dissemination of scholarship including websites, social media, etc. may also be considered as forms of scholarship. The nature of scholarship should be pertinent to the faculty member's track and pattern of responsibilities as defined above in this document.

c. Service

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the Department, College and University, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. In the College of Medicine, a candidate's service contributions must be demonstrated to be of high quality and effectiveness. All tenure track and clinical faculty members must contribute to service as evidenced by documentation of contributions over a sustained

period of time. In this document (above) are clear guidelines for how to document and assess the quality, significance and effectiveness of a faculty member's service.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the Department. The documentation of teaching is forwarded along with the dossier. External evaluations and departmental annual reviews are also forwarded with the dossier. Verification for all references and funding by a Procedures Oversight Designee also is included with the forwarded dossier.

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

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

If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT document 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)

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. Advisory Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (aAPT) Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review the Department's APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty. Holding in-person meetings is preferred; however, the goal is to have as many members of the aAPT committee participate in the meeting as is possible.
- To consider annually, in Spring semester (Jan-Mar), 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. A simple 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 or dossier as specified in Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure documents and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary clinical and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late Spring through early Autumn semester (~Mar-Aug), to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring (Mar-May):** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee. 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 (Mar-May):** The candidate should be shown the list of potential evaluators by the aAPT committee chair to identify any collaborators, conflicts of interest or other issues that could interfere with the objectivity of the reviews, and be invited to augment it with no more than three names of persons who meet the criteria for objective, credible, evaluators.
 - **Late Spring (Mar-May):** Submit the names of potential external evaluators to the Department Chair (see also Section VI.B.3 below).
 - **Summer (May-July):** Gather internal evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service from students and peers.
 - **Early Autumn (Aug-Sept):** 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 their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- To establish a mechanism (through coordination with the department Chair) for each candidate's dossier to be accessible for review by the Eligible Faculty (e.g.,

secure website) at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

- According to this document, the committee may draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Chair of the aAPT committee will revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, 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. This communication will be evaluative as well as descriptive and contextualize the vote, including any "minority opinions" as appropriate. In the event the candidate is on the tenure track, this letter must be written by a tenured faculty at the appropriate rank per University Faculty Rules.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the TIU head 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. Every effort should be made to schedule in-person meetings for these deliberations.
- To attend all meetings of the eligible faculty except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
- The evaluation by the Eligible Faculty is not advisory, but rather represents an independent review.

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair or designee are as follows:

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

- Late Spring Semester (Mar-May): To solicit external evaluations from the list of names suggested by the aAPT Committee and the candidate. The department Chair may also add names to this list. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The Chair of the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To ensure that the aAPT committee has coordinated with the department administrator to ensure that each candidate's dossier is made available in an accessible place for review by the Eligible Faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the Eligible Faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- Mid-Autumn Semester: Following receipt of the letter of the Eligible Faculty's completed evaluation and vote, to provide an independent written evaluation and conclusion regarding if a candidate's dossier meets the criteria for promotion and/or tenure. In the interest of an independent evaluation, the College of Medicine discourages the Department Chair from attending the committee of Eligible Faculty deliberations.
- To meet with the Eligible Faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate of the following in writing after completion of the Department's review process:
 - The recommendations by the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair
 - The availability of the written evaluations by the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair for the candidate to review.
 - The opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the College office by November 1.
- To receive the aAPT Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the Department Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

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

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the Department of Neuroscience will ask for evaluations from faculty in programs that are nationally recognized in their field or subfields. Neuroscience is a vast interdisciplinary science in which scientists apply expertise in biology, mathematics, engineering, computer science, chemistry, philosophy, psychology, medicine, etc. to study cellular, functional, behavioral, evolutionary, computational, molecular, cellular, structural and medical aspects of the nervous system. Because neuroscience experts are often found outside of traditional departments of neuroscience, a specific list of institutions or even programs cannot be easily devised.

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

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

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

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

- Is written by a person, not in conflict (see above) at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU). Peer reviewers from other institutions, including universities outside of North America, may be suggested in cases where the external reviewer is 1) a distinguished expert in the field, as indicated by publications; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; 2) is nationally or internationally known in a field outside of neuroscience but is related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects; 3) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed; and/or 4) where relevant, is a distinguished, award winning scientist or scholar who is not affiliated with an academic institution. Whenever possible, external reviewers will hold the rank of Professor. 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.
- If the Department is unable to obtain the required five external evaluations, it will document its efforts, noting the individuals who were contacted, how they were contacted, and the dates and number of times they were contacted. The Department will notify the College as soon as it becomes apparent that it will not be able to obtain the required letters in time for the meeting of the eligible faculty. The lack of five external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding, but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, aAP&T Chair, and the Department Chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and agree that it will not constitute a procedural error.

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and/or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters should be sought as are required, and they should be solicited no later than the end of the spring semester (typically first week in May) 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.

The Department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations (see example [here](#)). A sample letter for clinical faculty can be found [here](#).

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the advisory Appointment 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. If the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the Department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an

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

All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier. If concerns arise about any of the letters received or if there are concerns regarding low response rate (e.g., may be construed as reflecting on the merits of the candidate), these concerns may be addressed in the Department's written evaluations (from aAPT and/or the department Chair) and/or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

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

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

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions.

Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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

VIII. Reviews in the Final Year of Probation

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

If a terminal year review is conducted by the Department and the College, it will be made consistent with the Department's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, the College's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College, (2) the Rules of the University Faculty, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, including the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Department views teaching broadly, and it includes teaching in the classroom or in the laboratory. At a minimum, faculty are required to use the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). SEI reports can also be supplemented with other appropriate methods of student evaluation. If using the SEI, the faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. If using other forms of evaluation, the faculty member should not be present during the students' completion of the evaluation form or other online evaluation systems. 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 considered in future teaching.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department Chair or designee 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 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 and probationary clinical faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate professors on the clinical faculty at least once per year.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary clinical professors at least once every two years.
- 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 [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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 identified by the Peer

Review of Teaching Committee, 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 desired. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

X. APPENDICES

A. Research Scientists

1. Research Scientist and Senior Research Scientist Appointments

Research Scientists and Senior Research Scientists may be appointed in the Department of Neuroscience. Research scientist appointments are not the same as those described in Section IV.3 for Research Faculty. These are not fixed-term appointments and Research Scientists are not able to participate in departmental governance. To qualify as a Research Scientist, the candidate must have earned a doctoral degree in an appropriate field and have previous research experience. They should have authored publications, made presentations of papers to professional societies, and/or have contributed inventions, new designs or techniques that are of material significance in the solution of important applied programs. A typical candidate would have served in a postdoctoral position for at least two full years, have demonstrated productivity and would be competitive for an R01 grant from the NIH (or equivalent). They should have demonstrated a level of experience and productivity beyond that of a postdoctoral fellow.

Research Scientists and Senior Research Scientists are expected to secure external funding for their salary and to support their research program. They may direct undergraduate research and advise graduate students, subject to the approval of the relevant graduate studies committee and the Graduate School. They may also train postdoctoral fellows.

The request for the appointment of a Research Scientist may come from any faculty member (sponsor) or the Department Chair. All requests must include:

- A letter of support from the Department Chair (on Department letterhead) addressed to the [associate dean for research](#), of the College of Medicine. The letter should also request that the appointee be given PI status (if desired).
- The individual's CV
- A position description

Request letters and all supporting documentation for College of Medicine appointments can be sent to this [email address](#).

An individual should not be offered a Research Scientist or Senior Research Scientist position until the credentials have been reviewed and recommended by the Department Chair and approved by the Office of the Vice President for Research.

Approval must be granted before the information is entered into the Human Resources (HR) system. All actions for Research Scientists and Senior Research Scientists in the HR system are routed to the Office of Research for review and/or approval.

If an individual is being considered for the position, the credentials may be reviewed concurrent with or subsequent to the position posting approval. An individual holding a regular appointment at the university may be reclassified to a Research Scientist or Senior Research Scientist position. Reclassification requests must follow the same

process as above. Any individual in a temporary or term appointment is considered an external candidate and is not eligible for reclassification.

Research Scientist and Senior Research Scientist positions are in the Senior Administrative and Professional category and the 00 Pay Range. Qualified persons may be appointed for indefinite periods of time and renewals of appointment are contingent upon satisfactory performance as determined by the supporting unit (Sponsor) and the Department Chair.

The level of compensation (salary plus benefits) for the Research Scientist or Senior Research Scientist will be negotiated by the candidate and the Department faculty member that is the sponsor of record. Compensation amount at the time of appointment should be comparable to salary levels for other Research Scientists or Research Faculty with equivalent rank in the Department.

Research Scientists are not eligible for [faculty professional leave](#). They accumulate vacation at the rate of 176 hours/year and sick leave at 10 hours/month.

2. Promotion of Research Scientists to Senior Research Scientists

For promotion from Research Scientist to Senior Research Scientist, a candidate must have demonstrated the ability to obtain extramural funding and have authored a significant number of publications. The overall scholarship of the candidate should be equivalent to the requirements for promotion to full professor status in an academic unit. The Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee, at the request of the Department Chair, should generally perform this evaluation. Outside letters of recommendation are required. The candidates should not solicit their own outside letters and the reference letters should speak to and support the research experience and qualifications of the individual. The recommendation of the unit will be sent to the office of the Senior Associate Vice President for Research for final approval.

B. Faculty Checklist for Annual Review

1. Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (required for probationary faculty only)
2. Upload your **current CV** and peer-review of teaching to your private **OneDrive** folder.
3. If you have not created a page on Google Scholar, please do so. It only takes a minute.
4. Upload a completed 1-page (**maximum**) **narrative**. The goal of the narrative is to capture important facts and subtleties that may not be evident in your CV and that cannot be fully captured by numbers in the *Faculty Spreadsheet* (see below).

For tenure-track faculty, the narrative should describe your research output and impact, research funding, teaching and service activities for the year in review (spanning time from last annual review to current review period). For clinical faculty, your narrative should emphasize your teaching and service activities for the year in review; however, research-related activities should also be documented. For research faculty, the narrative should describe your research output and impact, research funding, and any other relevant activities for the year in review.

At the end of the narrative, please estimate the time that you dedicate to research, teaching and service. Tenure-track and clinical faculty should use the [Teaching and Service Time Allocations Guidelines](#) (see Appendix C) to estimate your time commitments in these two mission areas. Your remaining time (out of 100%) should be >50% and will be your estimated time allocated for research. If your time allocated to Teaching and Service is >50%, don't worry, we will work that out during the review meeting. The goal is to work to establish a balance of effort across research, teaching and service.

The narrative should also include a brief reflection on your goals in each mission area (i.e., *What are your career and personal development goals?*).

Finally, include a separate brief description (no more than 1 paragraph) of how your involvement in, or leadership of programs or committees has helped influence culture within or outside the Department. Simply saying that you served on a committee is not sufficient evidence of collegiality or citizenship.

5. Complete the revised [Faculty Spreadsheet](#) (located in your personal OneDrive folder). If your CV and narrative are complete, the spreadsheet should take <5 min.

A rating scale (1-3 points) will be used to score performance for **all faculty** using appointment-specific criteria. Specific details for clinical faculty are described below (see #7).

For tenure-track faculty, the rating scale below will be used to score performance in each of the following areas – *research output and impact, research funding, teaching and service*. Below are guidelines that set the benchmarks for “meeting expectations” in each area. The overall rating in each category will be weighted most heavily for the year in review but will also take into consideration progress over the past two review cycles.

- 0.0 – no significant activity in mission area
- 1.0– below expectations for position
- 1.5 – meets expectations for position with some room for improvement
- 2.0 – meets expectations for position
- 2.5 – meets expectations for position with demonstrated excellence in some areas
- 3.0 – exceeds expectations for position

C. Guidelines for assessing time allocated to service and teaching/mentoring (for tenure-track and clinical faculty)

As defined by OAA, full-time, twelve-month, faculty members are expected to be on duty for an average of nineteen working days a month, with working days defined as weekdays that are not designated as university holidays. Using these as guidelines, there are ~1,750 work hours/year (assumes 2 weeks/year for vacation) for a 12-month faculty. The percent time allocations below were derived using 1,750h/y or 35h/week as baseline metrics.

- 10% effort would = 175 h/y or 3.5h/week
- 15% effort would = 263h/y or 5h/week
- 20% effort would = 350h/y or 7h/week
- 30% effort would = 525/y or 10.5h/week
- 40% effort would = 700/y or 14 h/week
- 50% effort would = 875/y or 17.5 h/week
- 60% effort would = 1050h/y or 23h/week

The above calculations can be used to estimate workload across individual mission areas.

Service:

Typical service activities and estimated time requirements for each of these service activities include:

- Manuscript peer-review ~3h/manuscript (assuming 10/year): 30h/year
- Ad-hoc peer review for grant proposals (e.g., for standard NIH grant) = 10h/grant x 6 grants + 16h travel (if relevant; omit if online review) = 76h/year (for permanent members, multiply x3)
- Serve on a local (OSU) committee: 1h meeting/1x month = 12h/year
- Serve on a national/international committee: 1h meeting/1x month = 12h/year
- Write letters of recommendation (~30min/letter): 6 letters/year = 3h/year

Total: 133h/y (~8% time allocation)

For those serving as editors, permanent members of study sections, Directors of graduate programs (or similar), leadership positions in national or international societies, etc., service allocations could exceed 10-15% each year.

(10% effort would = 175 h/y or average of 3.5h/week)

Teaching and Mentoring:

A tenure-track faculty member with at least one NIH R01 (or equivalent) grant is expected to commit significant time as a research mentor for graduate and undergraduate students and post-doctoral trainees. However, tenure-track faculty also are expected to develop new course content, deliver lectures, prepare/administer exams and meet with students as part of formal lecture-based or laboratory courses. Below, guidelines are provided to help estimate annual % effort dedicated to teaching/instructional activity and mentoring.

Estimated time to mentor graduate/undergraduate students:

PhD student:

- Bi-weekly: 1h individual meetings (0.5h week/student)
- Bi-weekly: 2h research-in-progress group data meetings (1h/week total)
- Reading/editing writing, data sets, providing feedback on experiments, career guidance, etc. mostly via email or in prep for individual or group meetings (2h/week/student)
- Weekly lab meetings (admin and data) (1h/week total)

For a lab with one PhD student, ~3h/week per student + 1h/week for lab meetings = ~4h/week = 200 hours/year = **11% effort**

For a lab with two PhD students, up to 6h/week = 300 hours/year = **17%**

Note: The above guidelines are based on recommended meeting frequencies; however, each lab may increase/decrease accordingly based on need and individual preferences.

Undergraduate Students:

Since undergraduates usually work with graduate students and do not write manuscripts, significantly less time is needed to mentor undergraduates. On average, undergraduate training is expected to take at least half the effort of that required to train a new PhD student. A conservative estimate would be to add **1 hours/week = 50 hours/year (= 3% effort)** for each undergraduate student.

If the student(s) are doing an honors thesis project, estimate time as if they were a first-year graduate student.

Based on above estimates, faculty members who are mentoring at least one PhD student are committing, on average, 10-15% effort towards the teaching mission. Two or more PhD students increase this estimate to 15 - 20%. Each undergraduate student would add ~ 3% effort. However, because the effort of research mentorship is interwoven with and is required for a faculty member to meet their scholarly pursuits (and workload commitment to scholarly activities), these estimates should be considered as guidelines and not strict justification for reducing commitments to course development and formal lecturing. All tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute to the Department's teaching mission, including large enrollment and specialized courses in the undergraduate, graduate and medical school curriculums.

Estimated time requirements for didactic lecturing:

Giving a Lecture:

Each lecture (conventional, in-class):

- 4h preparation for an established lecture (Formatting/Objectives/Director)
- 2h to set up AV and give the lecture (Contact Hours)
- 1h meeting with students outside of class
- 0.5h answering emails
- 0.5h creating/disseminating evaluative questions
- 5h grading evaluative questions (~20 min/student; for 15 students in a course = 5h).

Estimated % Effort for:

- 1 lecture = $13\text{h}/1750 = 0.8\%$
- 2 lectures = $26\text{ h}/1750 = 1.5\%$
- 3 lectures = $39\text{ h}/1750 = 2.2\%$

Note: If developing a new lecture (instead of giving an established lecture) add 20 hours to the above estimates. Also, if lectures are recorded and made available online, after the first year, subtract at least 4 hours/lecture. Some classes will require more/less preparation time if content does not change year-over-year (see below for guidance).

Directing a Team-Taught Graduate Course:

- Organize and Develop Schedule, Identify/verify lecturers, help lecturers with content, as needed, Create Syllabus - 20h
- Course Set-Up and Maintenance (Carmen Site, Messages to Students, messages to lecturers, 1 hours/week Carmen Maintenance (posting content, adding people), managing complications with lecturers/scheduling - 10h
- Exam Management - 56h total:
 - Creating/updating exams – 5h/exam x 4 exams - 20h
 - Entering exam scores (4 exams/semester; 1h/exam) – 4 hours
 - Calculating grades (1 time at end of course) – 2h
 - Meet with students after exams (4 exams x 10 students (average) x 0.5h/student) – 20h
 - Exam reschedules due to absences – 5h
 - Remediation/retake/fail issues – 5h
 - Addressing student questions before taking the class, student permission, special accommodations, registration issue - 10h
 - Hearing and addressing lecturer/graduate program director or academic advisor concerns, complaints, comments, student review, requests for information – 10h
 - Analyzing SEIs and providing feedback - 10h

Total: 116h for directing a team-taught graduate course (6.6% effort)

Note: Similar additions/subtractions should be made using criteria described above for individual lectures.

Organize Course Without Giving any Lectures (e.g., Seminar or Journal Club, 1 credit hour): 51 hours = 2.9%

- 5h: Organize and Develop Schedule (over the entire year)
- 23h: Attend each session (includes set up of AV) = $1.5\text{ hour/week} \times 15\text{ weeks} = 22.5\text{ hours}$
- 22.5h: create and disseminate feedback to students/post grades $1.5\text{ hours} \times 15\text{ weeks}$

Total = $\sim 50\text{h}/1750 = 2.8\%$

Directing a 3-credit hour Undergraduate Course (assuming responsibility for all lectures and exams)

Student contact hours/course: 135 hours

- 3 credit hour course generally meets 2x/week for 1.3 hours = 2.6 + .4 for discussions before and after class = 3 contact hours/week, Semester = 15 weeks so total contact hours = 45 hours.
- Office hours (scheduled or unscheduled): 4h/week x 15 weeks = 60 hours
- Answering student Emails regarding content, ~2h/week = 30 hours

Administration: 40 hours

- Setting up course (syllabus), activating class, communication with students: 4h
- Carmen Management and other online programs (i.e. Socrative), determining final grades, registering grades with registrar: 2 hours/week x 15 weeks = 30h
- Managing student issues (poor performance/disability services/advising/absences/behavior issues): 6h

Preparing Established Lectures: 90 hours

- 3 hours/lecture, 2 lectures/week = 6h/week
- 15 week semester (15x6)

Creating New Lectures (one per year on average): 20 hours

Exam Preparation & Grading: 52 hours

- Preparing an established exam = 4 hours x 4 exams = 16h
- Grading = 4h x 4 exams = 16h
- Posting grades for large class = 1h x 4 exams = 4h
- Scheduling, administering and grading make up exams = 4h/exam = 16h

Total: 337 hours/course = 19% effort year/course

Effort Summary:

- Mentoring PhD students: 11-17%
- Mentoring non-thesis undergraduate student: 3%/student
- Didactic lectures in team taught course: 0.8%/lecture
- Directing team taught graduate course: 7.2% + 0.8%/lecture given
- Directing seminar/discussion course: 3%
- Course Director for undergraduate course: 19%/course

D. Annual Review Benchmarks for Scholarship – Research Output and Research Impact (for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty)

The following represent minimum or baseline metrics that, if met, would constitute an average rating of 2.0 (i.e., meets expectations) for research output and impact each year for a probationary, tenure-track faculty member. These annual baseline metrics follow the criteria for *Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews* (see Section VI of this document). However, all faculty, especially tenure-track Assistant and Associate Professors, should regularly review and refer to the *Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews* section of this document, and any feedback provided by their mentoring committees and the aAPT committee when setting goals and evaluating annual progress towards promotion/promotion and tenure.

The same metrics will be considered for Professors; however, as the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for professors for scholarship, teaching, academic citizenship, leadership and mentoring exceed those for all other members of the faculty. As such, baseline productivity metrics across all mission areas and a professor's annual participation in departmental programs is expected to exceed that of probationary faculty and tenured Associate Professors.

Note: The below expectations are for tenure-track faculty with 50% time allocated to the research mission. For somebody with 75% time allocated to Research, a proportional increase (~25%) would be expected across each area (output, funding, impact).

Research Output & Impact - Publishing and Presenting Data

- Publish 1-2 peer-review manuscripts as first or senior author
- Publish at least 1 peer-reviewed manuscripts as co-author (non-corresponding author)
- Provide evidence that additional publications and grant proposals are in development. This can be achieved by charting “soft” research metrics in the *Annual Review table* (e.g., abstracts submitted to scientific conferences, invention disclosures and patent applications, development of new collaborations) and also in the *required one-page narrative* that each faculty member will provide in advance of the annual review.
- Present data at research conferences (virtual or in-person) or invited lectures/seminars (virtual or in-person). Presentations by trainees for which you are the mentor of record are considered for annual review, but presentations by the candidate/faculty member are also expected.
- Provide peer reviews for journals, foundations, government funding agencies, etc.

In addition to the above metrics, in the narrative, *faculty members should include specific examples of how their research is making an impact*. Since the examples provided below may not be relevant to each faculty member, examples of impact are expected to vary. It is also recognized that it will be more difficult to provide multiple examples of impact for faculty in their first 1-2 years on the tenure track.

- Provide evidence that awareness of your research is growing (e.g., document the number of citations to your research publications year over year, participate in research communication by promoting your published research through media relations, etc.)
- Participate as a stakeholder or content advisor for any University, national or international committee or organization (e.g., serve on advisory panels).
- List awards or any other formal recognition of excellence.

- Acquire funding via philanthropy or via industry partnerships.
- Participate in research communication by promoting your published research through media relations or as an invited lecturer at national or international venues

Research Funding

The following represent minimum or baseline metrics that, if met, would constitute an average rating of 2.0 (i.e., meets expectations) for research funding for all tenure-track faculty.

- Achieve a minimum of 50% direct salary appointment to extramural grants
- Document progress on the development or submission of at least one new grant proposal (use narrative to explain)

E. Annual Review Benchmarks for Teaching, Education & Mentoring (for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty)

Evaluation of teaching and instructional activity will be based upon the quantity and the quality of teaching, considering the average percentage of time devoted to teaching or instructional activities relative to other mission areas, and relative to other Department faculty with similar time in rank. Quantity will be measured in part by the number of formal lectures given by a faculty member. Other examples of teaching or instructional activity that will be considered include: 1) serving as course director, 2) serving as major/permanent research advisor to graduate students, 3) participating in special graduate activities such as laboratories and student rotations, 4) participating as a member of qualifying, general and final examination committees and 5) advising professional and/or undergraduate student research. The quality of teaching will be assessed by means of student evaluation of instruction (SEI) and documented peer review letters.

The performance review for Research faculty will include comments and feedback on any teaching/instructional activity; however, unless specified in the faculty member's original contract, this is not a category used to determine merit awards for research faculty. Instead, consistent with the guidelines of appointment to this position, merit-based review and salary recommendations will be based on research output and impact (as defined above).

Tenure-track faculty should be able to document their time/effort committed to classroom teaching and individual instruction/mentoring. The annual review score for teaching/education/mentoring will be based on consideration of time allocated to this mission area relative to research workload (see above) and the overall quality/impact of teaching.

Below are examples of activities considered during evaluation of teaching/education/mentoring for tenure-track faculty.

Classroom Teaching

- Consistent contact hours in undergraduate, graduate or medical education
- Curriculum development; preparing of lectures for classroom instruction
- Writing questions for examinations; grading exams; meeting with students about lecture and/or exam materials
- Serving as course Director or co-Director (assumes role in coordinating the course, providing some lectures and/or course administration)
- Obtaining peer- and student reviews for in-room lectures

Individual Instruction (e.g., career or professional mentoring of undergraduates, PhD students, post-docs, junior faculty, etc.)

- Participate in mentoring trainees in research activities (rotations, research forums, honors thesis advising, PhD advising as primary mentor or dissertation committee)
- Participate in undergraduate or graduate programs: rotations, advising, recruitment/admissions activities, governance/policy decisions, program retreats. Simply being a member with "P" status in a program does not constitute participation.
- Participate as faculty mentor; read/edit grant proposals for junior faculty
- Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards

F. *Annual Review Benchmarks for Service (for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty)*

Service activity includes administrative work (e.g., for Department, College or University), service to the profession (e.g., reviewing grants and manuscripts, serving as an officer for professional organizations), and service to the community (e.g., local, state, national, or international). Serving as a formal advisor or mentor to junior or mid-career faculty may also be considered as service to the Department, College or University but should not be documented as service and as mentoring (see above). Service activity also includes heading teaching units and directing facilities, programs or centers (e.g., Department or College-based core facilities). Faculty members are expected to participate in both departmental and college governance. The average percentage of time a faculty member devotes to service activities will vary. As service activities tend to increase with seniority, the evaluation of service activities will be based upon the quantity and relative impact of the service then weighted, taking into account the average percentage of time devoted to other mission areas. To assist the Chair in the evaluation process and to help faculty members assess their service workloads, the total time spent on service activities should be estimated using the *Service Time Allocations Guidelines* (see Appendix C).

The performance review for Research faculty will include comments and feedback on any service activity; however, unless specified in the faculty member's initial contract, this is not a category used to determine merit awards for research faculty. Instead, consistent with the guidelines of appointment to this position, merit-based review and salary recommendations will be based on research output and impact (as defined above).

The following activities, if all performed during an annual review cycle, would constitute "minimum" expectations for most research-intensive, tenure-track faculty. Collectively, these efforts equate to ~10% effort:

- Review 1-2 manuscripts/month: 6h/month x 12 = 72h/year
- Preform peer review for a grant proposal (for standard NIH grant) = 6h/grant x 6 grants/cycle + 16h travel (if applicable) = 52h/year (for permanent members, multiply x3)
- Serve on a local committee: 1h meeting/1x month = 12h/year
- Serve on a national/international committee: 1h meeting/1x month = 12h/year
- Write letters of recommendation: 2h/year

For those serving as editors or as permanent members of study sections, this service could easily increase to 15%. Add to that national or international leadership positions in societies, etc. and a service effort of 20% or more would be reasonable.

G. *Annual Review Benchmarks for Clinical Faculty*

The same 1-3 rating scale used to score tenure-track (and research) faculty annual performance, will also be used for clinical faculty. However, annual accomplishments in teaching and mentoring will be the primary factors considered during the annual review process. Service and scholarship activities also will be considered and meritorious activity in one or both mission areas could result in higher scores (see below).

If significant progress can be documented in each of the following areas during the annual review process, a clinical faculty member would receive an AVERAGE rating of 2.0 (i.e., meets expectations).

- Teach all courses as agreed upon annually between the faculty member and the Department Chair. (faculty must be the course director/contact and all teaching credits must return to the Department of Neuroscience)
- Receive peer and student evaluations of instruction that are consistently positive and reflect excellence in teaching. For student evaluations with response rates below <50% of total registered students, faculty should document how they plan to improve response rates in future years.
- Document (in narrative) efforts to improve course content or delivery year-over-year.
- Provide substantive service on at least one committee in the Department.
- Provide mentorship to students and/or faculty in educational/pedagogical or research training. This could include providing regular peer-reviews for departmental faculty lectures or helping other faculty or students with course/lecture design and/or course administration.

Clear examples of one or more of the following would result in a score of 2.5 (i.e., meets expectations with demonstrated excellence) or 3.0 (exceeds expectations): (*scores will vary depending on the overall quality, amount and impact of the following metrics*)

- Develop new courses and/or teach lectures in addition to those agreed upon annually between the faculty member and Department Chair (all teaching credits for the new course(s) or individual lectures must return to the Department of Neuroscience)
- Receive a teaching award (or other honor related to your role as an educator/mentor)
- Document evidence of national impact (e.g., invitation to serve as faculty on national education program or society leadership in education or other similar national activity)
- Participate in programs focused on pedagogy of teaching.
- Document/provide evidence of improved educational processes or outcomes (impact)
- Provide substantive service on at least two committees, including one in the Department and the others in the College or University
- Demonstrate contributions to scholarship (e.g., papers regarding innovative teaching techniques, scholarly review articles and book chapters focused on education theory, new curricula, methods of evaluation. Some Clinical Faculty may publish review papers, book chapters and/or original investigator-initiated studies related to their area of research.

As described for tenure-track faculty, baseline teaching and mentoring expectations for clinical faculty will be weighted by rank (i.e., there are greater expectations for Associate Clinical Professors relative to Assistant Clinical Professors, etc.).