Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health

Approved by the Faculty: 11/9/05; 5/3/11; 7/16/13; 5/8/14; 6/20/16; 6/16/20; 5/18/21; 04/16/2024; 10/21/25

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 12/1/25

Contents

I Preamble 5
II Department Mission 5
III Definitions 5
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty 5
1 Tenure-track Faculty 6
2 Clinical Faculty 6
3 Research Faculty 6
4 Associated Faculty 7
5 Conflict of Interest 8
6 Minimum Composition 8
B Promotion and Tenure Committee 8
C Quorum 9
D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty 9
1 Appointment 9
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion 9
IV Appointments 10
A Criteria 10
1 Tenure-track Faculty 10
2 Clinical Faculty 11
3 Research Faculty 13
4 Associated Faculty 13
5 Emeritus Faculty 15
6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 16
7 Joint Appointments 16
B Appointment Procedures 16
1 Tenure-track Faculty 17
2 Clinical Faculty 17
3 Research Faculty 17
4 Transfer from and to the Tenure Track 18

5 Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU) Transfer 18
6 Associated Faculty 18
7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 19
8 Joint Appointments 19
V Annual Performance and Merit Review 19
A Documentation 20
B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty 20
1 Fourth-Year Review 21
2 Eighth Year Review 21
3 Extension of Tenure Clock 21
C Tenured Faculty 21
D Clinical Faculty 22
E Research Faculty 22
F Associated Faculty 22
G Salary Recommendations 23
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews 23
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion 24
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 24
2 Promotion to Associate Professor in Advance of Tenure 28
3 Promotion to Professor 32
4 Clinical Faculty 36
5 Research Faculty 54
6 Associated Faculty 56
B Procedures 57
1 Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty 57
a Candidate Responsibilities 57
b Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities 60
c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities 61
d Department Chair Responsibilities 62
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty 63
3 External Evaluations 63

a Peer and Near Peer Institutions 63
VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals 65
VIII Reviews in the Final Year of Probation 66
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation 66
A Student Evaluation of Teaching 66
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching 66
X Appendices 68
A Glossary of Terms 68
B American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics ... 69

I Preamble

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

Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the Department 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's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to Department mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this Department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal employment opportunity.

II Department Mission

The Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health is dedicated to the following activities: education of skilled professionals in clinical psychiatry, psychology, neuroscience, and related disciplines; discovery, evaluation and dissemination of knowledge and technology; and the provision of innovative solutions for improving health, with an emphasis on personalized health care.

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review**. For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the Department.

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

- For the promotion reviews of associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

2 Clinical Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant clinical professor; an associate clinical professor; or a clinical professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all clinical 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 clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors and all nonprobationary associate 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 faculty and all 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 of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

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

  Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty and all non-probationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

  The eligible faculty for reappointment reviews of associated faculty consists of all tenured faculty at or above the rank for which the candidate is being reviewed and all non-probationary clinical faculty at or above the rank for which the candidate is being reviewed.

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, clinical titles, 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.

  For the promotion reviews of associated clinical faculty, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for clinical faculty as described in Section IIII.A.2 above.

  The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5 Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

In addition, an individual who has had personal or professional conflicts with the candidate is ineligible to participate in the discussion and vote. It is the responsibility of the department chair to remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

6 Minimum Composition

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

B Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the eligible faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of 3-5 professors and 2-4

associate professors, at least 3 of whom are tenure track faculty; the remaining may be non-probationary clinical faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the Department chair. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible.

When considering cases involving clinical faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by an additional 1-5 nonprobationary clinical faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

When considering cases involving associated faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by an additional 1-2 nonprobationary associated faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

When considering cases involving research faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by an additional 1-2 nonprobationary 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 a simple majority (greater than 50%) of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave.

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

D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, faculty submit only "yes" and "no" votes—abstentions are not allowed and are not permitted in this department.

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

1 Appointment

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

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

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

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

IV Appointments

A Criteria

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

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

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

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

In the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health each appointee must obtain the appropriate Ohio licensure and other required certifications if necessary for successful execution of their faculty responsibilities.

Assistant Professor. An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the Department and the profession is highly desirable.

Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment.

In the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health each appointee must obtain the appropriate Ohio licensure and other required certifications if necessary for successful execution of their faculty responsibilities.

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

Consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-09, faculty members with significant patient clinical duties in the College of Medicine are granted an extended probationary period of up to 11 years, including prior service credit, depending on the pattern of research, teaching, and service workload. An assistant professor with an extended probationary period is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the 11th year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the 12th year. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 12th year will be the final year of employment.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and/or 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 may not occur.

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

2 Clinical Faculty

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

Clinical faculty are equivalent in importance to the Department as the Tenure Track faculty. The Clinical faculty exists for those faculty members whose principal career focus is outstanding teaching, clinical and translational research, and delivery of exemplary clinical service. Clinical

faculty members will generally not have sufficient protected 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 practice, integration, community engagement, and education, as well as new knowledge discovery. Faculty members appointed to the clinical faculty may choose to distinguish themselves in patient care, teaching, innovative educational program development, or research/scholarship.

The Department supports the Clinician-Scholar, Clinician-Educator, and Clinical-Excellence pathways. These appointments exist for faculty members with significant clinical duties who also engage in significant scholarship, education, and/or excel in clinical service delivery/clinical administration, respectively. Clinical Faculty members are expected to contribute to the Department's research, education, and/or service delivery missions. The Clinician-Scholar pathway reflects excellence in translational science, clinical research and health services (e.g., health care policy and comparative effectiveness research) as measured by publications and grant funding, respectively. While Clinician-Scholar faculty may serve as the MPI or PI on a grant proposal, securing extramural funding as MPI/PI is not required. However, participation as Co-I or collaborator in extramural funding proposals is expected. The Clinician-Educator pathway may reflect excellence as an educator as measured by teaching evaluations and innovative teaching practices, modules and publications. Alternatively, the Clinician Educator pathway may reflect an outstanding clinician who has a demonstrated record of educating colleagues and peers such as through invitations to serve as faculty on national continuing medical education programs. The Clinical Excellence pathway exists for faculty members who focus on exemplary clinical care or unique areas of emphasis in patient management. Faculty members on this pathway typically devote 80% or more of their effort to patient care or administrative service. Clinical-Excellence faculty attain recognition through the development, refinement, and/or expansion of clinical services. These faculty may build signature clinical programs and/or serve as preferred providers developing a regional or national reputation for clinical service expertise.

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

Assistant Clinical Professor. An earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree and the required licensure/certification in their specialty are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant clinical professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

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 or appropriate terminal degree and the required licensure/certification in his/her/their specialty, and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

3 Research Faculty

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

In general, research faculty appointments will require 95% salary recovery. The initial contract is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether they will be reappointed for the following year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

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

> **Research Assistant Professor**. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.
>
> **Research Associate Professor and Research Professor**. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4 Associated Faculty

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

Associated faculty may be compensated or uncompensated, and typically provide service to the department in the areas of research, clinical care, or education. For associated faculty who are principally focused on patient care, the criteria for an appointment at advanced rank will be identical to those for the clinical excellence pathway (see Section VI.A.4.c). For associated faculty who contribute principally through educational activities or scholarship, the appointment at advanced rank criteria and procedures will be identical to those for the clinician educator pathway (see Section VI.A.4.b).

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments **are 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.

Clinical Instructor of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor of Practice, Clinical Associate Professor of Practice, Clinical Professor of Practice. Associated clinical practice appointments may either be **compensated or uncompensated**. Uncompensated appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated academic service such as clinical supervision to the Department, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Associated clinical practice rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of clinical faculty. Associated clinical practice faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of clinical 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 cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, 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 lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

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

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

- Associated clinical faculty with clinical responsibilities must be a licensed physician or health care provider if required for successful execution of their faculty responsibilities.

- Have significant and meaningful interaction in at least one of the following mission areas of the College of Medicine:
    a) Teaching of medical students, residents, clinical fellows, undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows: For community physicians

providing outpatient teaching of medical students, meaningful interaction consists of supervising medical students for at least one month out of the year.

b) Research: These faculty members may collaborate with a TIU or division in the college in research projects or other scholarly activities.

c) Service to a TIU or the college: This includes participation in committees or other leadership activities (e.g., membership in the Medical Student Admissions Committee).

- No ongoing negative behavior such as discrimination, bullying, harassment, retaliation, or promotion of other hostile work conditions.
  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

Returning Retiree: Returning retirees are faculty who have retired from the University and return in any paid appointment at the University. Approvals are only for one year and must cover their salary and associated costs. 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. The 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. Refer to the APT Required Documents and Process site for more information (policy, required documents, and tip sheet).

5 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for Emeritus faculty status to the Department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department chair. The Department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting Emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-05-04, 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.

6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

7 Joint Appointments

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

B Appointment Procedures

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

The SHIFT (Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent) Framework was designed to identify and recruit broad, qualified applicant pools of extraordinary scholars who are leaders in their respective fields. Deans, department chairs, and search committee members work in partnership with the Office of Faculty Affairs and other key stakeholders in adherence to this framework to ensure a thorough, fair, and consistent faculty search process. The framework consists of four distinct phases—each of which includes a series of core requirements (must-do action steps) and optimal practices (aspirational action steps)—followed by a fifth phase focused on preboarding and onboarding.

This department adheres in every respect to the Framework requirements as detailed at SHIFT.

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

In addition, see the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, research, and associated faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit

- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

1 Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a broad pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in 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 of the college or 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.

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.

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

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

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

2 Clinical Faculty

Searches for clinical faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview may be on clinical/teaching/professional practice rather than scholarship.

3 Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the interview the candidate is not asked to make a presentation.

4 Transfer from and to the Tenure Track

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

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed.

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

5 Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU) Transfer

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

6 Associated Faculty

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department Chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the Executive Committee.

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

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

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

7 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 Department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this Department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the Department chair extends an offer of appointment. The Department Chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

8 Joint Appointments

The Department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State University TIU as described in Section IV.A (7). These appointments must be approved by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and will be reviewed every three years for renewal. Approval of the joint appointment by University Office of Academic Affairs 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 Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

The Department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment, which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

The annual performance and merit review of a faculty member is the responsibility of that faculty member's Department Chair.

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on

faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

- The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.
- Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.
- Annual performance and merit reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment.
- Per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, department chairs are 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

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department chair no later than March 1:

- Annual Evaluation Form, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- Updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty).*

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

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

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Department chair, assisted by the Vice Chairs/Division Directors, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department Chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the College. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments).
If the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the Dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1 Fourth-Year Review

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

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

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

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

If either the Department Chair or the Dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

2 Eighth Year Review

For faculty members with an 11-year probationary period, an eighth-year review, utilizing the same principles and procedures as the fourth-year review, will also be conducted.

3 Extension of 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 Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or designee, who submits a written performance review to the Department chair along with comments on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The Department Chair or designee conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or designee, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the Department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students or junior faculty; and 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 leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

D 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 non-probationary clinical faculty may participate in the review of clinical faculty of lower rank.

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

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E Research Faculty

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

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

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

F Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The Department Chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals.

The Department Chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Department Chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the Department Chair, or designee, who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the Department Chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The Department Chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

Uncompensated associated faculty members will be reviewed annually by the P&T Associated Faculty Subcommittee who will submit recommendations with regard to re-appointment to the Department chair.

G Salary Recommendations

The Department Chair makes annual salary recommendations to the Dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months. For clinical faculty, salary recommendations are under the auspices of the College of Medicine Compensation Plan.

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

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

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

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

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

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEACHING Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Teaching awards and other honors • Documented impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities such as web-based design, mobile application, virtual teaching, methods of evaluating teaching, program or course

	development, publications on teaching, and societal leadership in education. • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are valued. • Programs that improve access to teaching for learners from all backgrounds. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge	• 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, and diffusion research, among many potential others. • Substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings
A sustained record or scholarly productivity, reflected in both quantity and quality of publications	• 15-25 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an assistant professor (required). The range of publications may be adjusted in relation to the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is allocated to clinical/administrative service and or the norms for rates of publication within their field of research. Overall impact of scholarship is important. • In instances where a faculty member was as Assistant Professor at another institution, the total volume of scholarly work since being appointed as Assistant Professor at that institution will be considered in meeting the requirement above. • High impact and positive trajectory of scholarship, including work showing national impact. • The pattern of scholarship should include an increasing proportion of publications as first, senior, or corresponding author, but importance of other authorship positions as a key/indispensable contributor is to be considered. • The number of citations of their publications, and/or citation record may be used to demonstrate impact of work. • Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%) and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles • Book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion. • The impact factor of a journal may or may not reflect the quality of the scholarship. For example, in some areas of research the best journal may have a relatively low impact

	factor but may be highly cited. Conversely, publication in journals with a very high impact factors reflects broader interest but does not in and of itself demonstrate the impact of research. • There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.
Obtaining a national recognition and impact for a program of scholarship (required)	• Evidence of sustained or multiple external peer-reviewed grant support (required, see below for grant type requirements) • Invited platform presentations at national/international scientific sessions • Visiting Professorships at peer institutions • Invitations to serve on editorial boards, study sections, or grant review sections • Social media portfolios such as blog vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics • The above support the demonstration of national recognition and impact but this list is not comprehensive.
Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research or team science	• Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented may be considered (required). • Participation as multiple principal investigator (MPI) on nationally funded projects, principal investigator of components of NIH U or P grants, and participation as an essential core service provider on multiple externally-funded grants in which the contribution of the faculty member is clearly evident.
Innovation and entrepreneurship	• Entrepreneurship with patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials technology commercialization • Designing and/or supervising the construction of creative products (e.g., new technologies, devices, software, algorithms) which advance health-related science and healthcare • Developing and securing intellectual property such as patents, patent disclosures and licensing of University-developed intellectual property • Commercializing intellectual property through innovation and entrepreneurial activities such as entity creation, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements • 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 • Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer- reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenue should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and

	materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. • Entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion and tenure dossier
Evidence of significant external peer reviewed grant support, national foundation awards, or large-scale industry collaborations (required)	• NIH (or comparable) funding as a principal investigator or multiple principal investigator (MPI) on a R01, P01, U54, or K award or other comparable funding, including but not limited to the National Science Foundation, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Initiative (PCORI), the Department of Defense, the Food and Drug Administration, the US Department of Agriculture, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Required). • Demonstrated sustainability of their research program by renewal of the award and/or by garnering a second distinct nationally competitive, peer-reviewed grant (required). The latter may include support from prominent national charitable foundations. Examples include but are not limited to the American Heart Association, the March of Dimes, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Brain Behavior Research Foundation, the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, the American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, a major industry grant or other federal entities o For clinician scientists, depending on the extent of clinical responsibilities, significant funding through pharmaceutical or other industry for investigator-initiated proposals may be considered. • Serving as the site-principal investigator for a multi-center trial or principal investigator for a project included as part of a multi-project grant does not satisfy the expectation for extramural funding on the tenure track. • Creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding. • Efforts to increase care access for all through funded projects/protocols will be considered.

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion and tenure decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements since appointment to the tenure track at The Ohio State University. It should be appreciated that evidence of scholarship below the specified range does not preclude a positive promotion decision especially if reasonable extenuating circumstances exist. Scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive tenure or promotion decision, especially if it occurs in isolation or without impact or focus. Scholarship in the context of poor performance in other areas such as absence of evidence of teaching excellence may affect decisions.

SERVICE Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Administrative service to the department, COM, or University	• Appointment to, election to, or leadership of departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups • Service on departmental or COM UME/GME committees • Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	• Clinical program development or enhancement • Innovative programs that advance the mission of the University or hospital, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community • Design and implementation of a novel program to improve care access for all patients.
Professional service to the fields encompassed by the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health including, but not limited to, Neuroscience, Psychiatry, Psychology, and Social Work.	• Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University • Performing journal reviews • Serving on editorial boards or editorships • Service as a grant reviewer for national funding agencies, elected or appointed offices held • Service to local and national professional societies, service as an advocate for mental health clinical care, education, and/or research and funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies to the extent it serves the mission of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health and The Ohio State University • Service on panels and commissions, and professional consultation to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. • Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion. • Candidates can consider demonstrating impact of their work by utilization of social and traditional media (such as X, Facebook, Instagram, Threads)

2 Promotion to Associate Professor in Advance of Tenure

Faculty members with significant clinical responsibilities with an eleven-year probationary period who fully meet the teaching and service requirements for promotion to associate professor with tenure, but not all of the research requirements, may petition for promotion to associate professor without tenure.

The Department may also propose a faculty member for promotion consideration (without tenure) in cases where a faculty member is making progress but has not achieved the necessary requirements for tenure. In addition, faculty committees (at the Department or College) or administrators (Chair or Dean) may determine that a faculty member's accomplishments do not

merit tenure and may recommend promotion in advance of tenure even if a faculty member has requested promotion with tenure. Promotion in advance of tenure may only occur if a candidate is not in the mandatory review year.

Faculty members who are promoted without the award of tenure must be considered for tenure no later than the mandatory review date or six years following promotion, whichever comes first.

TEACHING Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Teaching awards and other honors • Documented impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities such as web-based design, mobile application, virtual teaching, methods of evaluating teaching, program or course development, publications on teaching, and societal leadership in education. • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are valued. • Programs that improve access to teaching for learners from all backgrounds. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge	• 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, and diffusion research, among many potential others. • Substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings
A sustained record or scholarly productivity, reflected in both quantity and quality of publications	• 10-15 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an assistant professor (required). The range of publications may be adjusted in relation to the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is allocated to clinical/administrative

	service and or the norms for rates of publication within their field of research. Overall impact of scholarship is important. • In instances where a faculty member was as Assistant Professor at another institution, the total volume of scholarly work since being appointed as Assistant Professor at that institution will be considered in meeting the requirement above. • High impact and positive trajectory of scholarship, including work showing national impact. • The pattern of scholarship should include an increasing proportion of publications as first, senior, or corresponding author, but importance of other authorship positions as a key/indispensable contributor is to be considered. • The number of citations of their publications, and/or citation record may be used to demonstrate impact of work. • Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%) and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles • Book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion. • The impact factor of a journal may or may not reflect the quality of the scholarship. For example, in some areas of research the best journal may have a relatively low impact factor but may be highly cited. Conversely, publication in journals with a very high impact factors reflects broader interest but does not in and of itself demonstrate the impact of research. • There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time
Emerging national reputation (required)	• Invitations to serve as ad hoc journal reviewer • Invited platform presentations at national/international scientific sessions • Visiting Professorships at peer institutions • Invitations to serve on editorial boards, study sections, and grant review sections • Social media portfolios such as blog vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics • The above support the demonstration of national recognition and impact but this list is not comprehensive.
Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research or team science	• Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented may be considered. • Participation as co-principal investigator on nationally funded projects, principal investigator of components of NIH U or P grants, and participation as an essential core service provider on multiple externally- funded grants in which the contribution of the faculty member is clearly evident.

Innovation and entrepreneurship	• Entrepreneurship with patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials technology commercialization • Designing and/or supervising the construction of creative products (e.g., new technologies, devices, software, algorithms) which advance health-related science and healthcare • Developing and securing intellectual property such as patents, patent disclosures and licensing of University-developed intellectual property • Commercializing intellectual property through innovation and entrepreneurial activities such as entity creation, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements • 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 • Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer- reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenue should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. • Entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion and tenure dossier
Promising trajectory in extramural funding	• Serving as a principal investigator on an R21, R03, K award or an equivalent grant, co-investigator status on a R01 NIH grant award • Serving as principal investigator on foundation or other extramural grants. • Creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding. • Efforts to increase care access for all through funded projects/protocols will be considered.

SERVICE Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Administrative service to the department, COM, or University	• Appointment to, election to, or leadership of departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups • Service on departmental or COM UME/GME committees • Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	• Clinical program development or enhancement

	• Innovative programs that advance the mission of the University or hospital, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community • Design and implementation of a novel program to improve care access for all patients.
Professional service to the fields encompassed by the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health including, but not limited to, Neuroscience, Psychiatry, Psychology, and Social Work.	• Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University • Performing journal reviews • Serving on editorial boards or editorships • Service as a grant reviewer for national funding agencies, elected or appointed offices held • Service to local and national professional societies, service as an advocate for mental health clinical care, education, and/or research and funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies to the extent it serves the mission of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health and The Ohio State University • Service on panels and commissions, and professional consultation to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. • Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion. • Candidates can consider demonstrating impact of their work by utilization of social and traditional media (such as X, Facebook, Instagram, Threads)

3 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

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

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be

achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

TEACHING Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Course or workshop leadership and design • Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K- awards • Training program directorship, teaching awards, and organization of national course and curricula and participation in specialty boards. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Programs that improve cultural competence and access to teaching for all learners. • Professional development in mentoring or teaching and making changes to teaching or mentoring approaches to increase the success of all learners. • Mentorship of junior faculty is expected (required). It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just ad hoc coaching. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their mentorship. • Candidates with clinical duties should demonstrate consistent and effective teaching of trainees and practicing clinicians, and leadership in the administration of clinical training programs.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge	• 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, and diffusion research, among many potential others. • Substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings

A sustained record of scholarly productivity, reflected in both quantity and quality of publications	• 25-35 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an associate professor (required). The range of publications may be adjusted in relation to the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is allocated to clinical/administrative service and or the norms for rates of publication within their field of research. Overall impact of scholarship is important. • In instances where a faculty member was as Associate Professor at another institution, the total volume of scholarly work since being appointed as Associate Professor at that institution will be considered in meeting the requirement above. • High impact and positive trajectory of scholarship, including work showing national impact. • The pattern of scholarship should include an increasing proportion of publications as first, senior, or corresponding author, but importance of other authorship positions as a key/indispensable contributor is to be considered. • The number of citations of their publications, and/or citation record may be used to demonstrate impact of work. • Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%) and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles • Book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion. • The impact factor of a journal may or may not reflect the quality of the scholarship. For example, in some areas of research the best journal may have a relatively low impact factor but may be highly cited. Conversely, publication in journals with a very high impact factors reflects broader interest but does not in and of itself demonstrate the impact of research. • There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time
National Leadership and International Reputation (required)	• Election or appointment to a leadership position in a national or international society • Service as a national committee or task force chair, chair of an NIH or other federal review panel, regular membership on an NIH study section, peer recognition or awards for research, editorial boards or editorships of scientific journals, and invited lectures at hospitals or universities outside the country or at meetings of international societies. • Invited platform presentations at national/international scientific sessions • Visiting Professorships at peer institutions • Invitations to serve on editorial boards, study sections, and grant review sections • National/international reputation/impact may also be demonstrated in part through non-traditional metrics (e.g., social media portfolios, Altmetrics scores)

Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research or team science	• Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented may be considered. • Participation as co- principal investigator on nationally funded projects, principal investigator of components of NIH U or P grants, and participation as an essential core service provider on multiple externally- funded grants in which the contribution of the faculty member is clearly evident.
Innovation and entrepreneurship	• Entrepreneurship with patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials technology commercialization • Designing and/or supervising the construction of creative products (e.g., new technologies, devices, software, algorithms) which advance health-related science and healthcare • Developing and securing intellectual property such as patents, patent disclosures and licensing of University-developed intellectual property • Commercializing intellectual property through innovation and entrepreneurial activities such as entity creation, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements • 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 • Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer- reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenue should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. • Entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion and tenure dossier
Evidence of sustained or multiple external peer reviewed grant support, national foundation awards, or large-scale industry collaborations (required)	• NIH (or comparable) funding as a principal investigator or multiple principal investigator (MPI) on a R01, P01, U54, or K award or other comparable funding, including but not limited to the National Science Foundation, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Initiative (PCORI), the Department of Defense, the Food and Drug Administration, the US Department of Agriculture, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Required) • Demonstrated sustainability of their research program by renewal of the award and/or by garnering a second distinct nationally competitive, peer-reviewed grant (required). The latter may include support from prominent national charitable foundations. Examples include but are not limited

	to the American Heart Association, the March of Dimes, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Brain Behavior Research Foundation, the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, the American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, a major industry grant or other federal entities o For clinician scientists, depending on the extent of clinical responsibilities, sustained and significant funding through pharmaceutical or other industry for investigator- initiated proposals may be considered. • Serving as the site-principal investigator for a multi-center trial or principal investigator for a project included as part of a multi-project grant does not satisfy the expectation for extramural funding on the tenure track. • Creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding. • Efforts to increase care access for all through funded projects/protocols will be considered.

SERVICE Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Administrative service to the department, COM, or University	• Appointment to, election to, or leadership of departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees, working groups, sections, divisions, or centers
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	• Clinical program development or enhancement • Innovative programs that advance the mission of the University or hospital, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community • Design and implementation of a novel program to improve care access for all patients.
Professional service or provision of expertise outside the institution	• Leadership roles in professional organizations • Journal editorships • Roles as a board examiner, membership on a subspecialty board • Professional consultation to industry, government, and education • Service as a grant reviewer for national funding agencies, elected or appointed offices held • Service on panels and commissions, and professional consultation to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. • Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

4 Clinical Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor. For promotion to assistant clinical professor, a faculty member must complete his/her/their doctoral degree and meet the required

licensure/certification in their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor. For promotion to associate clinical professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this Department. Board certification (or its equivalent) is expected. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate clinical professor differ, based on the pathway chosen (Clinician Scholar, Clinician Educator, Clinical Excellence), as outlined below. For clinical faculty, excellence in scholarship alone is not sufficient for promotion. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

a. CLINICIAN SCHOLAR PATHWAY

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor on the Clinician-Scholar pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition as a clinician scholar since being appointed to the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor. Evidence of national recognition and impact should be related to the primary focus of this pathway (scholarship), but can also be related to clinical, educational, or professional service but is not required in all domains.

TEACHING Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers. The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts (required). • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors • Programs that improve access to teaching for learners from all backgrounds. • Potential venues for teaching excellence range from traditional lecture formats to bedside instruction to digital materials, including social and digital media-based education.
Favorable impact on teaching and training programs	• Curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are particularly valued

	• Professional development in mentoring or teaching and/or making changes to teaching or mentoring approaches to increase the success of all learners.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Contributions to scholarship; participated in basic, translational, clinical, informatics, education, or health services research projects or in clinical trials.	• 10-20 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an assistant professor (required). The range of publications may be adjusted in relation to the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is allocated to clinical/administrative service and or the norms for rates of publication within their field of research. Overall impact of scholarship is important. Evaluation of the strength of a candidate's publication record is shaped by authorship position, journal impact factors, thematic nature of the work, relevance to the fields encompassed by the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health, impact, and originality. If these factors are all favorable, the number of publications necessary for favorable consideration might be 10. If these factors are less compelling, more might be needed. • In instances where a faculty member was as Assistant Professor at another institution, the total volume of scholarly work since being appointed as Assistant Professor at that institution will be considered in meeting the requirement above. • High impact and positive trajectory of scholarship, including work showing national impact. • The pattern of scholarship should include an increasing proportion of publications as first, senior, or corresponding author, but importance of other authorship positions as a key/indispensable contributor is to be considered. • The number of citations of their publications, and/or citation record may be used to demonstrate impact of work. • Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%) and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles • Book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion. • The impact factor of a journal may or may not reflect the quality of the scholarship. For example, in some areas of research the best journal may have a relatively low impact factor but may be highly cited. Conversely, publication in journals with a very high impact factors reflects broader interest but does not in and of itself demonstrate the impact of research. • There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time

Obtaining a national recognition and impact for a program of scholarship (required)	• Evidence of external peer-reviewed grant support, national foundation awards, or large-scale industry collaborations (required, see below for grant type requirements) • Invited platform presentations at national/international scientific sessions • Visiting Professorships at peer institutions • Invitations to serve on editorial boards, study sections, or grant review sections • Social media portfolios such as blog vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics • The above support the demonstration of national recognition and impact but this list is not comprehensive.
Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research or team science	• Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented may be considered. • Participation as co- principal investigator on nationally funded projects, principal investigator of components of NIH U or P grants, and participation as an essential core service provider on multiple externally- funded grants in which the contribution of the faculty member is clearly evident.
Evidence of external peer reviewed grant support, national foundation awards, or large-scale industry collaborations	• A track record of funding as Principal Investigator, Co-investigator or collaborator is required. Sources of funding may include NIH or other comparable funding, including but not limited to the National Science Foundation, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Initiative (PCORI), the Department of Defense, the Food and Drug Administration, the US Department of Agriculture, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention and the Brain and Behavior Research Foundation) • Efforts to increase care access for all through funded projects/protocols will be considered • Creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding.

SERVICE Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Administrative service to the department, COM, or University	• Appointment to, election to, or leadership of departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups

	• Service on departmental or College of Medicine GME committees • Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	• Clinical program development or enhancement • Innovative programs that advance the mission of the University or hospital, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community • Design and implementation of a novel program to improve care access for all patients.
Professional service to the fields encompassed by the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health including, but not limited to, Neuroscience, Psychiatry, Psychology, and Social Work.	• Leadership of or election to a national committee or organization • Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University • Performing journal reviews • Serving on editorial boards or editorships • Service as a grant reviewer for national funding agencies, elected or appointed offices held • Service to local and national professional societies, service as an advocate for mental health clinical care, education, and/or research and funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies to the extent it serves the mission of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health and The Ohio State University, • Service on panels and commissions, and professional consultation to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. • Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.
Innovative program development	• Development of initiatives that promote improved health care of communities and/or training to support community building and equal opportunity

b. Clinician Educator Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor on the Clinician-Educator Pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition as a clinician educator since being appointed to the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor. Evidence of national recognition and impact should be related to the primary focus of this pathway (clinical or didactic education), but can also be related to clinical, scholarship, or professional service. Excellence is not required in all domains. The Clinician-Educator pathway may reflect effectiveness as an educator of trainees at any level. Alternatively, the clinician educator pathway may reflect an outstanding clinician who has a demonstrated record of educating colleagues and peers, such as through invitations to serve as faculty on national continuing medical education programs. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

TEACHING Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Evidence of national impact and recognition as a clinician educator (required)	• Evidence of external peer-reviewed grant support, national foundation awards, or large-scale industry collaborations for educational activities • Invited platform presentations with regard to educational practices at national/international scientific sessions • Visiting Professorships at peer institutions • Invitations to serve on editorial boards, study sections, or grant review sections • Social media portfolios such as blog vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics • The above support the demonstration of national recognition and impact but this list is not comprehensive.
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors. • Programs that improve access to teaching for learners from all backgrounds. • Potential venues for teaching excellence range from traditional lecture formats to bedside instruction to digital materials, including social and digital media-based education.
Favorable impact on teaching and training programs (required)	• Curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are particularly valued • Professional development in mentoring or teaching and/or making changes to teaching or mentoring approaches to increase the success of all learners

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Contributions to scholarship; participated in basic, translational, clinical, informatics, education, or health services research projects or in clinical trials.	• 10-15 peer-reviewed publications or other scholarly works since appointment as an assistant professor (required). Examples of other scholarly works include published review articles, invited commentaries, published guidelines, book chapters, the development of web-based or video-teaching modules, peer-reviewed or collaborative curricula that reach a national audience, and other digital media. High impact and positive trajectory of scholarship, including work showing national impact. • In instances where a faculty member was as Assistant Professor at another institution, the total volume of scholarly work since being appointed as Assistant Professor at that institution will be considered in meeting the requirement above. • Social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/ podcast/vodcast authorship/ editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics will be considered. Consider incorporating the use of Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate's work utilizing traditional and social media platforms. However, these non-traditional metrics do not in and of themselves demonstrate the impact of research. • Publications may focus on pedagogic theory, innovative teaching techniques, educational content promoting success for all learners, development of web-based or video-teaching modules, and podcasts for example. They also may focus on the broad spectrum of original scholarship and research, including clinical science, basic science, health services research, outcomes research, quality improvement science, unique clinical observations and case series, meta-analyses, and guidelines, et cetera. • Acquisition of grant funding is highly valued by not required. • There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.

SERVICE Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Administrative service to the department, COM, or University	• Appointment to, election to, or leadership of departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups

	• Service on departmental or College of Medicine GME committees • Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	• Clinical program development or enhancement • Innovative programs that advance the mission of the University or hospital, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community • Design and implementation of a novel program to improve care access for all patients
Professional service to the fields encompassed by the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health including, but not limited to, Neuroscience, Psychiatry, Psychology, and Social Work.	• Leadership of or election to a national committee or organization • Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University • Performing journal reviews • Serving on editorial boards or editorships • Service as a grant reviewer for national funding agencies, elected or appointed offices held • Service to local and national professional societies, service as an advocate for mental health clinical care, education, and/or research and funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies to the extent it serves the mission of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health and The Ohio State University, • Service on panels and commissions, and professional consultation to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. • Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.
Innovative program development	• Development of initiatives that promote improved health care of communities and/or training to support community building and equal opportunity

c. Clinical Excellence Pathway

Faculty members with predominantly clinical or clinical administrative responsibilities (ordinarily 80% or greater) may be considered for promotion based on clinical excellence. These faculty are recognized for the scholarship of practice or application which consists of making novel contributions to the advancement of the practice in their field. Local or regional recognition for outstanding clinical care is a hallmark of qualification for Associate Clinical Professor on the Clinical Excellence Pathway. National recognition is not a requirement for faculty candidates being considered for Associate Clinical Professor on the Clinical Excellence Pathway. The awarding of promotion to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor on the Clinical Excellence Pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has demonstrated a level of excellence and a record of impact relating to clinical care. Promotion will not be granted purely on the basis of length of service to the institution, clinical productivity, or satisfactory job performance. A faculty member who qualifies for promotion on this pathway should have supportive annual evaluations that document clinical effort in the years leading up to promotion on this pathway.

These faculty are expected to support the research and teaching mission of the Department, but the focus of the promotion review is on demonstration of clinical excellence. The documentation and demonstration of outcomes or impact is required. It is not expected that candidates will meet all of the examples below, but meeting only one will not satisfy the demonstration of collective impact of excellence.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, CLINICAL EXCELLENCE PATHWAY Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Teaching Excellence	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors. • Programs that improve access to teaching for learners from all backgrounds. • Potential venues for teaching excellence range from traditional lecture formats to bedside instruction to digital materials, including social and digital media-based education. • Curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are particularly valued • Professional development in mentoring or teaching and/or making changes to teaching or mentoring approaches to increase the success of all learners
Scholarship Excellence	• While traditional research (e.g., clinical, translational, basic, or population health science) is not a focus of this pathway, publications, presentations, or written reports demonstrating success in clinical performance (as detailed below) are valued • Acquisition of grant funding is highly valued but not required
Excellence in clinical performance	• Multiple lines of evidence supporting excellence in clinical performance, including discipline relevant clinical measures such as, but not limited to quality indicators, mortality metrics, complication rates, turnaround times, readmission rates, process improvements and patient satisfaction rates where performance measures can easily be internally and externally benchmarked for comparison (required). o Clinical productivity metrics (e.g. wRVU) per se, are not sufficient for supporting excellence in clinical performance. • Preferred provider recognition. Referral patterns or other metrics that indicate acknowledgment of a faculty

	member's expertise such as, but are not limited to, the number of cases referred for a second opinion, patients referred from other states or other regions within Ohio. • A record that demonstrates that a faculty member is frequently consulted by health care providers from outside the OSU/NCH system for advice about patient care. • Evidence that health care providers from other medical centers come to OSU/NCH for training specifically by the faculty member, or request proctoring at their home institution by the faculty member. • A record that demonstrates the faculty member has been invited to lecture locally, regionally, or at other hospitals, academic medical centers or statewide professional societies. • Clinical program development. Evidence that a faculty member has developed a new program or led improvements in an existing program and that subsequent to those innovations the success of the program has materially improved, or the program has been duplicated or adopted within the Medical Center/NCH or by other institutions or practices. • Evidence that a faculty member has developed clinical innovations that have been adopted by other health care providers within or outside the Medical Center/NCH. • Evidence that the faculty member participates as an instructor in local or statewide courses or seminars. • Selection for inclusion in physician rankings such as Best Doctors, Castle-Connolly, U.S. News Physicians Survey or similar rankings. • Receipt of awards from local, state, national organizations for clinical excellence. • Participation in the development of institutional or statewide practice guidelines. • Publications in which the faculty member is first or senior author that reflect clinical expertise and proficiency (review articles, book chapters, etc.).

Promotion to Clinical Professor. For promotion to clinical professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to this Department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

a. Clinician Scholar Pathway

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

TEACHING Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors • Participation in education and training- related specialty committees, specialty societies and specialty board committees. Examples are Resident Review Committees, specialty boards such as the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology, American Board of Professional Psychology, and the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education committees. • Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards and other such mentored programs is very highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity • Programs that improve access to teaching for learners from all backgrounds. • Potential venues for teaching excellence range from traditional lecture formats to bedside instruction to digital materials, including social and digital media-based education. • Mentorship of junior faculty and documentation of the positive impact resulting from that mentorship (required)
Favorable impact on teaching and training programs	• Curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are particularly valued • Professional development in mentoring or teaching and/or making changes to teaching or mentoring approaches to increase the success of all learners

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Required: a sustained and expanded impact and national/emerging international reputation for scholarship	• 20-30 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an associate professor (required). The range of publications may be adjusted in relation to the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is allocated to clinical/administrative service and or the norms for rates of publication within their field of research. Overall impact of scholarship is important. Evaluation of the strength of a candidate's publication record is shaped by authorship position, journal impact factors, thematic nature of the work, relevance to the fields encompassed by the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health, impact, and originality. If these factors are all favorable, the number of publications necessary for favorable consideration might be 20. If these factors are less compelling, more might be needed. • In instances where a faculty member was as Associate Professor at another institution, the total volume of scholarly work since being appointed as Associate Professor at that institution will be considered in meeting the requirement above. • Faculty members who participate in team science may have a record of scholarship primarily as middle author. In these cases, there must be evidence from other domains that demonstrate at the national level the faculty member's unique expertise (e.g., invitation to serve on study sections, invitation to speak at national meetings, etc). • High impact and positive trajectory of scholarship, including work showing national impact. • The pattern of scholarship should include an increasing proportion of publications as first, senior, or corresponding author, but importance of other authorship positions as a key/indispensable contributor is to be considered. • The number of citations of their publications, and/or citation record may be used to demonstrate impact of work. • Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%) and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles • Book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion. • The impact factor of a journal may or may not reflect the quality of the scholarship. For example, in some areas of research the best journal may have a relatively low impact factor but may be highly cited. Conversely, publication in journals with a very high impact factors reflects broader interest but does not in and of itself demonstrate the impact of research.

	• There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time
Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research or team science	• Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented may be considered. • Participation as co-principal investigator on nationally funded projects, principal investigator of components of NIH U or P grants, and participation as an essential core service provider on multiple externally-funded grants in which the contribution of the faculty member is clearly evident. • Generally, a greater number of collaborative or middle author publications are required to achieve impact and a national reputation, compared with first and senior author publication.
Acquired and sustained competitive external funding in support of their research program (required)	• A sustained track record of funding as Principal Investigator, Co-investigator or collaborator (*required)*. Sources of funding may include NIH or other comparable funding, including but not limited to the National Science Foundation, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Initiative (PCORI), the Department of Defense, the Food and Drug Administration, the US Department of Agriculture, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention and the Brain and Behavior Research Foundation) • Efforts to increase care access for all through funded projects/protocols will be considered. • Creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding.

SERVICE Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Administrative service to the department, COM, or University	• Leadership of departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups • Service on departmental or COM UME/GME committees • Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	• Clinical program development or enhancement • Innovative programs that advance the mission of the University or hospital, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community • Design and implementation of a novel program to improve care access for all patients

Professional service to the fields encompassed by the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health including, but not limited to, Neuroscience, Psychiatry, Psychology, and Social Work.	• Leadership of or election to a national committee or organization • Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University • Performing journal reviews • Serving on editorial boards or editorships • Service as a grant reviewer for national funding agencies, elected or appointed offices held • Service to local and national professional societies, service as an advocate for mental health clinical care, education, and/or research and funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies to the extent it serves the mission of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health and The Ohio State University, • Service on panels and commissions, and professional consultation to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. • Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.
Innovative program development	• Development of initiatives that promote improved health care of communities and/or training to support community building and equal opportunity

b. Clinician Educator Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor on the Clinician-Educator pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that that the candidate has developed a national level of impact/leadership or international recognition since appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor. Evidence of international recognition or national leadership should be related to the primary focus of the pathway (clinical or didactic education), but can also be related to clinical, scholarship activities, or professional service. Excellence is not required in all domains. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

TEACHING Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Evidence of national impact/leadership or international recognition as a clinician educator (required)	• Evidence of external peer-reviewed grant support, national foundation awards, or large-scale industry collaborations for educational activities • Invited platform presentations with regard to educational practices at national/international scientific sessions • Visiting Professorships at peer institutions • Invitations to serve on editorial boards, study sections, or grant review sections • Social media portfolios such as blog vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics

	• The above support the demonstration of national impact/leadership or international recognition but this list is not comprehensive. • Leadership roles on national/international education-focused committees or organizations
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors • Participation in education and training- related specialty committees, specialty societies and specialty board committees. Examples are Resident Review Committees, specialty boards such as the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology, the American Board of Professional Psychology, and the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education committees. • Mentorship of junior faculty also demonstrates teaching excellence. This should take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, not ad hoc career coaching. • Programs that improve access to teaching for learners from all backgrounds. • Potential venues for teaching excellence range from traditional lecture formats to bedside instruction to digital materials, including social and digital media-based education.
Favorable impact on teaching and training programs (required)	• Curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are particularly valued • Professional development in mentoring or teaching and/or making changes to teaching or mentoring approaches to increase the success of all learners

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Contributions to scholarship; participated in basic, translational, clinical, informatics, education, or health services research projects or in clinical trials.	• 15-20 peer-reviewed publications or other scholarly works since appointment as an associate professor (required). Examples of other scholarly works include published review articles, invited commentaries, published guidelines, book chapters, the development of web-based or video-teaching modules, peer-reviewed or collaborative curricula that reach a national audience, and other digital media. High

	impact and positive trajectory of scholarship, including work showing national impact. • In instances where a faculty member was as Associate Professor at another institution, the total volume of scholarly work since being appointed as Associate Professor at that institution will be considered in meeting the requirement above. • Social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/ editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics will be considered. Consider incorporating the use of Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate's work utilizing traditional and social media platforms. However, these non-traditional metrics do not in and of themselves demonstrate the impact of research. • Publications may focus on pedagogic theory, innovative teaching techniques, educational content promoting success for all learners, development of web-based or video-teaching modules, and podcasts for example. They also may focus on the broad spectrum of original scholarship and research, including clinical science, basic science, health services research, outcomes research, quality improvement science, unique clinical observations and case series, meta-analyses, and guidelines, et cetera. • Publications also may focus on the broad spectrum of original scholarship and research, including clinical science, basic science, informatics, health services research, outcomes research, quality improvement science, unique clinical observations and case-series, meta-analyses, and guidelines, et cetera. • Published works may be based on their areas of clinical expertise which 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 clinical practice. Some faculty members may combine these two areas of career emphasis. • Development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are considered to be published works. • In the current era of team 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. • Acquisition of grant funding is highly valued by not required • There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.

SERVICE Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Administrative service to the department, COM, or University	• Appointment to, election to, or leadership of departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups • Service on departmental or COM UME/GME committees • Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee
Advocacy for mental health clinical care, education, and/or research	• Advocacy for mental health clinical care, education, and/or research
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	• Clinical program development or enhancement • Innovative programs that advance the mission of the University or hospital, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community • Design and implementation of a novel program to improve care access for all patients.
Professional service to the fields encompassed by the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health including, but not limited to, Neuroscience, Psychiatry, Psychology, and Social Work.	• Leadership of or election to a national committee or organization • Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University • Performing journal reviews • Serving on editorial boards or editorships • Service as a grant reviewer for national funding agencies, elected or appointed offices held • Service to local and national professional societies, service as an advocate for mental health clinical care, education, and/or research and funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies to the extent it serves the mission of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health and The Ohio State University, • Service on panels and commissions, and professional consultation to industry, government, education, and non-profit organizations. • Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.
Innovative program development	• Development of initiatives that promote improved health care of communities and/or training to support community building and equal opportunity

c. Clinical Excellence Pathway

Faculty members with predominantly clinical or clinical administrative responsibilities (ordinarily 80% or greater) may be considered for promotion based on clinical excellence. These faculty have distinguished themselves by having particularly outstanding clinical outcomes. These faculty are recognized for the scholarship of practice or application which consists of making novel contributions to the advancement of the practice in their field. The awarding of promotion to the rank of Professor on the

Clinical Excellence Pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has demonstrated a sustained and enhanced level of excellence in clinical care and has developed a national impact and recognition since being appointed to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor (required). Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered to the rank of Clinical Professor (required). National awards for clinical excellence and innovation are clear indicators of achievement.

Promotion will not be granted solely on the basis of length of service to the institution, time in rank, clinical productivity, or satisfactory job performance. A faculty member who qualifies for promotion on this pathway should have supportive annual evaluations that document clinical effort since achieving the rank of Associate Clinical Professor. These faculty are expected to support the research and teaching mission of the Department, but the focus of the promotion review is on demonstration of clinical excellence. The documentation and demonstration of outcomes or impact is required. It is not expected that any candidate will meet all of the examples below, but meeting only one will not satisfy the demonstration of collective impact of excellence.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR, CLINICAL EXCELLENCE PATHWAY Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. It is additionally expected that the faculty demonstrate evidence of College values in service activities. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Teaching Excellence	• Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors. • Programs that improve access to teaching for learners from all backgrounds. • Potential venues for teaching excellence range from traditional lecture formats to bedside instruction to digital materials, including social and digital media-based education. • Curriculum innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and program or course development • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are particularly valued • Professional development in mentoring or teaching and/or making changes to teaching or mentoring approaches to increase the success of all learners • Mentorship of junior faculty and documentation of the positive impact resulting from that mentorship (required)
Scholarship Excellence	• While traditional research (e.g., clinical, translational, basic, or population health science) is not a focus of this pathway, publications, presentations, or written reports demonstrating success in clinical performance (as detailed below) are valued • Acquisition of grant funding is highly valued by not required

Excellence in clinical performance and national impact/reputation (required)	• Multiple lines of evidence supporting excellence in clinical performance, including discipline relevant clinical measures such as, but not limited to quality indicators, mortality metrics, complication rates, turnaround times, readmission rates, process improvements and patient satisfaction rates where performance measures can easily be internally and externally benchmarked for comparison (required). o Clinical productivity metrics (e.g. wRVU) per se, are not sufficient for supporting excellence in clinical performance. • Preferred provider recognition. Referral patterns or other metrics that indicate acknowledgment of a faculty member's expertise such as, but are not limited to, the number of cases referred for a second opinion, patients referred from other states or other regions within Ohio. • A record that demonstrates that a faculty member is frequently consulted by health care providers from outside the OSU/NCH system for advice about patient care. • Evidence that health care providers from other medical centers come to OSU/NCH for training specifically by the faculty member, or request proctoring at their home institution by the faculty member. • A record that demonstrates the faculty member has been invited to lecture locally, regionally, or at other hospitals, academic medical centers or statewide professional societies. • Clinical program development. Evidence that a faculty member has developed a new program or led improvements in an existing program and that subsequent to those innovations the success of the program has materially improved, or the program has been duplicated or adopted within the Medical center or by other institutions or practices. • Evidence that a faculty member has developed clinical innovations that have been adopted by other health care providers within or outside the Medical Center/NCH. • Evidence that the faculty member participates as an instructor in local or statewide courses or seminars. • Selection for inclusion in physician rankings such as Best Doctors, Castle-Connolly, U.S. News Physicians Survey or similar rankings. • Receipt of awards from local, state, national organizations for clinical excellence. • Participation in the development of institutional or statewide practice guidelines. • Publications in which the faculty member is first or senior author that reflect clinical expertise and proficiency (review articles, book chapters, etc.).

5 Research Faculty

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

Promotion to Research Associate Professor.

Candidates for promotion to research associate professor are expected to demonstrate the beginnings of a national recognition of their expertise. Research faculty are not expected to establish an independent program of research, but rather support the investigative work of others. It is expected in general that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of 95% salary recovery from extramural sources. Research faculty typically serve as coinvestigators, and independent extramural funding as principal investigator or multiple principal investigator is not required. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Teaching Excellence	• Not required, although participation in teaching and mentoring of trainees and early career faculty is valued and may be included
Service Excellence	• Not required
Documentation of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship based in area of expertise.	• 20-25 peer-reviewed journal publications since their appointment as a research assistant professor (required). First, senior, or corresponding authorships are not necessarily expected, but a faculty member should demonstrate their 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. • There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.
Demonstrate the beginnings of a national recognition of their expertise (required)	• 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 • National reputation/impact may also be demonstrated in part through non-traditional metrics (e.g., social media portfolios, Altmetrics scores.

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 established for promotion to associate professor. Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research. It is expected in general that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of 95% salary recovery from extramural sources. A record of continuous peer-reviewed

extramural and/or commercial funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Research faculty typically serve as co-investigators, and independent extramural funding as principal investigator or a multiple principal investigator) is not required. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO RESEARCH PROFESSOR Please note that these are not intended to be a list of requirements but are examples for consideration for individual candidates. Promotion decisions are based on the totality of the accomplishments of the candidate as detailed above. Required elements are noted.	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Teaching Excellence	• Not required, although participation in teaching and mentoring of trainees and early career faculty is valued and may be included
Service Excellence	• Not required
Documentation of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship based in area of expertise.	• 25-35 peer-reviewed journal publications since their appointment as a research associate professor (required). First, senior, or corresponding authorships are not necessarily expected, but a faculty member should demonstrate their 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. • There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.
Established national recognition of their expertise (required)	• 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 • National reputation/impact may also be demonstrated in part through non-traditional metrics (e.g., social media portfolios, Altmetrics scores.

6 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 Clinical Associate Professor of Practice and Clinical Professor of Practice. The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated clinical practice faculty members shall be the

same as those for the promotion of clinical faculty above. For associated clinical practice faculty who are principally focused on patient care, the criteria for promotion will be identical to those for the clinical excellence pathway (see Section VI.A.4.c). For associated clinical practice faculty who contribute principally through educational activities or scholarship, the promotion criteria and procedures will be identical to those for the clinician educator pathway (see Section VI.A.4.b).

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 under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. Candidates are also responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete 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 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 them.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the initial date of employment on the faculty at OSU to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to 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 non-probationary 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.

The following paragraphs provide suggested standards for documenting excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Typically, documentation of teaching for the promotion dossier will include one or more of the following:

- 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)
- Resident evaluations (e.g., MedHub)
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports
- 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 o presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
    - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

Scholarship can include 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, etc. The nature of scholarship should be pertinent to the faculty member's appointment type and pattern of responsibilities. Evidence of scholarship can include but is not limited to:

- peer reviewed journal articles, bulletins and technical reports
- original books and monographs
- edited books
- chapters in edited books
- editor reviewed journal articles
- reviews and abstracts
- papers in proceedings
- unpublished scholarly presentations
- externally funded research
- funded training grants

- other funding for academic work
- prizes and awards for research or scholarly or creative work
- major professional awards and commendations
- invited lectures at other universities, symposia, and conferences
- invention disclosures
- patent activity
- entrepreneurship
- technology commercialization
- software development
- editorship of a major collection of research work
- leadership of advanced seminars and symposia under organizational sponsorship
- invitations to serve on national review bodies
- grants and contracts submitted and received
- demonstration of the impact of the scholarship, as documented with citation data, impact factors, book distribution data, adoption of texts or procedures by external departments or academic health centers, and so forth.

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, exemplary patient care, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University.

- All tenure track and clinical faculty members must contribute to service as evidenced by documentation of contributions over a sustained period of time.
- Evidence of administrative service to the University may include appointment or election to Department, College, and/or University committees, holding administrative positions; development of innovative programs, and participating in mentoring activities.
- Program Development, reflecting the integration of teaching, service and research in a specific content area, may be given special recognition and significance.
- Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include editorships of, or service as, a reviewer for journals or other learned publications; offices held and other service to professional societies.
- Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University includes service as a reviewer of grants or other scholarly proposals, external examiner or advisor, a panel and commission participant, and as professional consultant to industry, government, and education.
- While provision of high-quality patient care is expected of all faculty members with clinical responsibilities, in and of itself it is insufficient for meeting the service requirement for tenure track and clinical faculty.

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

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

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed using the Department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of clinical and research faculty), whichever of

these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure track faculty, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

- **External Evaluators**

  Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

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

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. A 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 and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

  - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04A(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, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

  - **Late Spring:**

- Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

- Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

- **Early Autumn**

  - Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

  - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

  - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.

  - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department chair.

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

  - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees from another TIU. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's recommendation must be provided to the other Department substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this Department's cases.

c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

The evaluation by the eligible faculty is not advisory, but rather represents an independent review. The responsibilities of the members of the Eligible Faculty Committee are as follows:

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

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

d Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. The department will ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner. For tenure-track assistant professors, department chairs are to 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.

- **Early Summer**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

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

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

  - To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty 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.

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

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

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

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

  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and Department chair

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

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

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

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

- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other Departments, and to forward this material, along with the Department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the chair of the other Department by the date requested.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

3 External Evaluations

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

a Peer and Near Peer Institutions

1) Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center
2) Boston University
3) Columbia University
4) Duke University
5) Indiana University
6) Michigan State University
7) Mount Sinai School of Medicine
8) Northwestern University
9) University of Arizona
10) University of California, Davis
11) University of California, Los Angeles
12) University of California, San Diego
13) University of Cincinnati
14) University of Illinois, Chicago
15) University of Iowa
16) University of Kentucky
17) University of North Carolina
18) University of Michigan
19) University of Tennessee

20) University of Texas
21) University of Toledo
22) University of Virginia
23) University of Washington
24) University of Wisconsin
25) Vanderbilt University

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

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews other than associated faculty. These letters must be external to the Department. For tenure track, research, clinical educator, and clinical scholar candidates, letters must be external to the university. Clinical excellence candidates may have letters from this institution. As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Candidates are permitted to suggest external evaluator names following the criteria below. However, per Faculty Rule 3335-06-04 (B) 3, "no more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate."

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 with the exception of clinical faculty on the clinical excellence or clinical educator pathway for whom a minimum of three credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator (no shared publications in the last three years, unless part of a very large multi-centered project with a large number of authors), or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This Department will solicit evaluations only from faculty in programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. Faculty being considered for promotion on the clinical excellence pathway may have evaluators from this university or from local/regional experts, including a minority of evaluators who are not faculty members, but whose positions afford them the ability to comment on the impact of the candidate's portfolio of professional activities.

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

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than June 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.

In the event that the Department is unable to obtain the required number of external evaluations, the Department must document its efforts, noting the individuals who were contacted, how they were contacted, and the dates and number of times they were contacted. The unit is to notify the college as soon as it becomes apparent that it will not be able to obtain the required letters in time for the meeting of the eligible faculty. The lack of the required external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding, but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, P&T Chair, and the Department head all agree in writing that it may proceed and agree that it will not constitute a procedural error.

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found here. A sample letter for clinical faculty can be found here.

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

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

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

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

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

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

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

VIII Reviews in the Final Year of Probation

In most instances, a decision to deny promotion and tenure in the penultimate probationary year (11th year for faculty members with significant clinical responsibilities, 6th year for those without significant clinical responsibilities) 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 (or twelfth) 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 faculty member themselves. Details of the criteria and procedures for a review in the final year of probation are described in University Rule 3335-6-05 (B).

If a terminal year review is conducted by a department and the College, it will be made consistent with this 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: (l) the College, (2) the *Rules of the University Faculty*, (3) the University Office of Academic Affairs, including the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department chair oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process in collaboration with the Vice Chair for Education and other relevant faculty.

Annually the Department Chair, in consultation with the Vice Chair for Education, 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 senior faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the Department.

Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

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

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty at least once per year during each year of service before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate clinical professors at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six-year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.

- To review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary clinical professors, at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.

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

- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

Reviews conducted upon the request of the Department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the Department Chair or faculty member and may or may not include teaching observations.

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

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

X Appendices

A. Glossary of Terms

Adjunct Faculty – 0% FTE, non-salaried, non-clinical associated faculty that participate in the education and training of medical students. E.g. community faculty (see also **Associated Faculty**). An adjunct appointment is not the same as a **Courtesy Appointment**.

APT – **Appointments, Promotion and Tenure**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Extension of the Tenure Clock – the ability to have up to three years taken off the time clock toward achieving tenure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Non-mandatory review – voluntary promotion or tenure review

OAA – **Office of Academic Affairs**

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

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

Practice Faculty – an associated faculty appointment for those who will have a paid associated faculty appointment or have a paid appointment (e.g. staff, physician) through OSU, OSUP, or NCH. (see also **Associated Faculty**)

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

Probationary period – the length of time in which a faculty member on the Tenure track has to achieve tenure (e.g. 6 years for assistant professor faculty without clinical service, 11 years for assistant professor faculty with significant patient clinical service responsibilities). It is also defined as the first contract for faculty on the Clinical faculty or Research faculty.

Professionalism - exemplary behavior including demonstration of honesty and integrity in all realms of work; respect for patients, faculty, staff, and learners at all levels; evidence of commitment to continued learning and personal betterment; the encouragement of questions, debate, and acceptance of differing viewpoints without demonstration of prejudice or bias. Maintenance of these behaviors is consistent with the values of The Ohio State University and the College of Medicine.

Reappointment Review – the review of a Clinical or Research faculty member in the penultimate year of their contract to determine if the contract will be renewed.

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

SEI – **Student Evaluation of Instruction**

Tenure – permanent employment status only granted to faculty on the Tenure Track when the probationary period is successfully completed

Tenure Initiating Unit, usually synonymous with Department. Centers and Institutes are not Tenure Initiating Units

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

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

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

B. American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline

and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

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