

**Appointments, Promotion, and
Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
College of Medicine
Department of Radiology**

Approved by the Faculty: 10/15/25
Provisionally Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 12/10/25

Table of Contents

I PREAMBLE	4
II DEPARTMENT OF RADIOLOGY MISSION/GOALS	4
III DEFINITIONS	6
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
1 Tenure-track Faculty	6
2 Clinical Faculty	6
3 Research Faculty	7
4 Associated Faculty	7
5 Conflict of Interest	8
6 Minimum Composition	9
B Promotion and Tenure Committee	9
C Quorum	10
D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	10
1 Appointment	10
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	10
IV APPOINTMENTS	10
A Criteria	10
1 Tenure-track Faculty	11
2 Clinical Faculty	14
3 Research Faculty	17
4 Associated Faculty	18
5 Emeritus Faculty	21
6 Joint Appointments	22
7 Courtesy appointments	22
B Appointment Procedures	22
1 Tenure-track Faculty	23
2 Clinical Faculty	24
3 Research Faculty	24
4 Transfers: Track and TIU	24
6 Associated Faculty	25
8 Joint Appointments	26
9 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	26
V ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW	26
A Documentation	27
B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	27
1. Fourth Year Review	28

2. Eighth Year Review	28
3. Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	28
C Annual Review Procedures: Tenured Faculty	29
D Annual Review and Reappointment Procedures: Clinical Faculty.....	29
E Annual Review and Reappointment Procedures: Research Faculty	30
F Annual Review Procedures: Associated Faculty.....	30
G Salary Recommendations	31
VI PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	31
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	32
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	36
2 Promotion to Associate Professor in Advance of Tenure	41
3 Promotion to Professor	44
4 Clinical Faculty	51
A) Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway	51
B) Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway.....	54
C) Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway	58
D) Clinical Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway	61
E) Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway	65
F) Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway	67
5 Research Faculty.....	70
6 Associated Faculty	73
B Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion Review: Procedures for Tenure Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty .	74
1 Tenure-Track, Clinical and Research	74
a Candidate Responsibilities.....	74
b Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	79
c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities	80
d Department Chair Responsibilities	81
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty	82
3 External Evaluations	82
VII PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS.....	84
VIII REVIEWS IN THE FINAL YEAR OF PROBATION	85
IX PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	85
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	85
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	85
X APPENDICES	86

APPENDIX A – Key Definitions & Glossary of Terms 86
APPENDIX B – AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics 89

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#) annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the University Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) and other policies and procedures of the College and University to which the Department of Radiology and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department of Radiology 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 of Medicine and University 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 mission of the College of Medicine and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure. In approving this document, the Dean of the College of Medicine and the University Office of Academic Affairs accepts the mission and criteria of the Department of Radiology and delegates to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to the College's mission and criteria.

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

Decisions considering all 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/Goals

To be a leading Radiology Department and Imaging Services team that:

- Delivers exceptional patient care
- Breaks new ground through team science and discovery
- Trains tomorrow's clinicians, innovators, and leaders
- Includes, collaborates, and inspires
- Puts our patients and people first

The Department of Radiology is the component of OSUCOM providing sub-specialized professional support to the Imaging Services team of OSU Wexner Medical Center (from this point on, referred to as "OSUWMC") and the James Cancer Center. The clinical care-focused and research-focused faculty members of the Department provide multiple services including, but not limited to, the following:

- Oversight of clinical activities related to image-based diagnosis and therapy, from the standpoints of delivery, quality, safety, and utilization.
- Instruction, supervision, and/or evaluation of performances of both professional and technical personnel (certified and in-training) involved in providing imaging services.

- Applied-clinical, translational, and basic imaging research, as well as research in medical imaging physics, to improve:

1. Knowledge about a variety of acquired or congenital disease processes.
2. Current understanding of the clinical value of imaging-guided diagnosis and treatments.
3. Future value of imaging towards improving lives.

- Advancement of Radiology and the imaging sciences through innovation leading to clinical practices, lines of investigation, and instructional directions of the field in the future.

- Administrative involvement in the imaging-related operations of both OSUCOM and OSUWMC facilities.

Patient health maintenance, detection and prevention of pathology, and/or disease management through the application and advancement of medical diagnostic imaging and/or image-directed therapy are major priorities of the Department. Accordingly, its faculty members are committed to providing patient-focused medical care and pledge to:

1. Help guide optimal decision-making by both patient and referring provider with utilization of available evidence-based recommendations, advanced informatics capabilities, and safety metrics on imaging-guided diagnosis and treatments, as well as promoting patient-specific considerations.
2. Use effective communication methods and tools to benefit patients and help them participate in informed decision-making.
3. Deliver timely and accessible imaging-guided diagnosis and treatments, as needed, to support high-quality clinical care; and
4. Provide prompt, accurate, and commonly understood reporting on imaging-related findings and processes.

To achieve this mission, all faculty members are expected to support the teaching, service, and research goals of the Department in a manner that is consistent with the nature of their faculty appointment. Faculty members on the tenure-track are expected to have responsibilities in all aspects of the mission and are expected to have a relative emphasis of their efforts on research or other scholarly accomplishments. Clinical faculty members are also expected to have responsibilities in all aspects of the academic mission and are expected to have a relative emphasis on teaching and service. Research faculty members are expected to have an emphasis on scholarly accomplishments with a service component, but with no teaching requirement. Associated faculty's primary function is education and patient care, though scholarly activity is encouraged. The Department strives to enhance the quality of its endeavors by fostering the professional development and improvement of all faculty members. Although citizenship or collegiality cannot be used as criteria for promotion or tenure independent of teaching and scholarship, these attributes permeate the ability of a faculty member to contribute with effectiveness to teaching, scholarship and service. Therefore, it is expected that each candidate for promotion and/or tenure should demonstrate a commitment to the principles entailed in these concepts, and as reflected in the Statement of Professional Ethics of the American Association of University Professors (Appendix B). These include the manner in which the faculty member responds to their duties, responsibilities, and authority as a faculty member, and the manner in which the faculty member shares duties, responsibilities, and authority among their colleagues.

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

The Department Chair, the Dean and Assistant/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.

In the Department of Radiology, initial decisions about the appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of tenure-track assistant professors, clinical assistant professors, and research assistant professors are based on search committee recommendations, following the University's SHIFT framework, to the Department Chair. Initial appointment offers for associated faculty appointments are typically the purview of the Division Chief (if applicable) in consultation with the Department Chair.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** The search committee is responsible for providing the Department Chair with recommendations on the candidates.

The Committee of Eligible Faculty does not vote on initial appointments at Instructor or Assistant Professor ranks.

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors and the tenure reviews of untenured associate professors, the Eligible Faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the promotion reviews of tenured associate professors, the Eligible Faculty consists of all tenured professors.

2 Clinical Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** The search committee is responsible for providing the Department Chair with recommendations on the candidates.

The Committee of Eligible Faculty does not vote on initial appointments at Clinical Instructor or Assistant Clinical Professor ranks.

- **Advanced Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank (associate professor or professor) must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested in the department.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3 Research Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** The search committee is responsible for providing the Department Chair with recommendations on the candidates.
- The Committee of Eligible Faculty does not vote on initial appointments at the rank of Assistant Research Professor..
- **Advanced Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank (associate professor or professor) must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary 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 and of research professors, the Eligible Faculty consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary research professors.

4 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- The recommendation for new appointment to the Department Chair is the responsibility of the search committee.
- In the case of Associated Faculty at Nationwide Children's Hospital, the recommendation for new appointment is the responsibility of the division chief.

- Initial appointments at advanced rank, must be requested by the Division Chief and 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.
- Reappointment procedures are as follows:
 - Clinical Practice Faculty at Nationwide Children’s Hospital (NCH):
 - Reappointment is at the discretion of the Department Chair and does not require a vote.
 - Clinical Practice Faculty at OSUWMC:
 - For the reappointment and promotion reviews of clinical assistant professor of practice, the Eligible Faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, all non-probationary associate clinical professors, all non-probationary clinical professors.
 - For the reappointment and promotion reviews of clinical associate professors of practice, and the reappointment and reviews of clinical professors of practice, the Eligible Faculty consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary clinical professors.

Promotion Reviews

Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and clinical practice 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 practice faculty, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for clinical faculty as described in Section III.A.2 above.

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 TIU within the College.

B Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Department has an Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee that assists the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The APT Committee is comprised of a minimum of five (5) non-probationary faculty members (minimum of 2 associate professors, 3 professors) appointed by the Department Chair. At least one member on the committee must be a tenured professor. The Chair of the committee is either the Vice Chair for Faculty Affairs, or another faculty member appointed by the Department Chair who functions under the oversight and supervision of the Vice Chair for Faculty Affairs. 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 up to three (3) non-probationary clinical faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

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

C Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is a simple majority (>50%) of the Eligible Faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty members on approved University leave (e.g., medical, business, parental) are not counted when determining 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 with a competing scheduling constraint at the scheduled meeting time are not excused absences and do count as members of the Eligible Faculty.

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

D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

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

- In the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment, search committees make their recommendations to the Department Chair.
- A positive recommendation from the Eligible Faculty for appointment at advanced rank is secured when a simple majority (greater than 50%) of the votes cast is positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the Department will seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to 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 greater than half (>50%) of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the Department will seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment Department prior to their reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

IV Appointments

A Criteria

The Department of Radiology 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, trainees, 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.

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 Department to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

Each appointee must obtain the appropriate Ohio licensure and other required certifications if required for successful execution of their faculty responsibilities.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

The tenure-track exists for those faculty members who primarily strive to achieve sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship and successful competition for extramural funding. Although excellence in teaching and outstanding service to The Ohio State University is required, these alone are not sufficient for progress on this track.

There must be an expectation that faculty members who are appointed to the tenure-track will be assigned a workload that provides sufficient time for the faculty member to meet the expectations and requirements for tenure-track appointments. The appointment process requires the Department to provide sufficient evidence in support of a tenure-track faculty appointment so as to ensure that the faculty candidate has clearly and convincingly met or exceeded applicable criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service [see Section VI. of this document for examples].

All faculty members have access to all pertinent documents detailing Department, College of Medicine, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. The most updated documents are located [here](#).

Appointment: Instructor on the Tenure Track

An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary. During the probationary period, a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Appointments at the rank of instructor are appropriate for individuals who could need time to establish a research program and set themselves up for the requirements to progress toward tenure. Appointments to this rank may also be made if all the criteria for the position of assistant professor have been met with the exception that the candidate will not have completed a terminal degree, or other relevant training, at the time of the appointment. When an individual is appointed to the rank of instructor, the letter of offer should indicate the specific benchmarks and achievements required for promotion to assistant professor.

Procedures for appointments 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. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year and the third year will be the terminal year of employment. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review following completion of the required credentialing.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. Unless there are unique circumstances, the Department does not recommend requesting prior service credit. This request must be approved by the Department's eligible faculty, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the University Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit is irrevocable except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

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

- Anticipated receipt of an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Individuals who have completed all the requirements of their terminal degree, but who have not obtained the final degree at the time of initial employment will be appointed as an instructor. In addition, appointment at the rank of instructor is appropriate for individuals who, at the time they join the faculty, do not have the requisite skills or experience to fully assume the full range of responsibilities of an assistant professor.
- Evidence of potential for excellence in scholarship. Such evidence might include peer-reviewed publications in a mentored setting, but insufficient evidence of an independent, creative, and productive program of research with potential for external funding.
- No ongoing negative behaviors 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 [Appendix B].
- In aggregate, accomplishments related to the above criteria should be sufficiently compelling that the appointee is judged to have significant potential to attain tenure and a distinguished record as a faculty member in the Department of Radiology.

Appointment: Assistant Professor on the Tenure Track

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary. During a probationary period, a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Tenure cannot be awarded at the rank of assistant professor. An assistant professor must be reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the mandatory review year (6th year of appointment for faculty without significant clinical responsibilities, 11th year of appointment for faculty with significant clinical service responsibilities). However, promotion and tenure may be granted by following the promotion and tenure review process at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement so merits. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the provision of University Rule [3335-6-08](#) and the provision of paragraphs (6), (H), and (I) of University Rule [3335-6-03](#).

Consistent with Faculty Rule, [3335-6-09](#), faculty members without significant clinical duties are reviewed for promotion & tenure no later than the 6th year as to whether promotion and tenure will be

granted at the beginning of the 7th year. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Faculty members with significant clinical duties 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.

For appointments at the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit of up to three years may be granted for work experience at the time of the initial appointment. Doing so requires the approval of the eligible faculty, Department Chair, Dean, and executive vice president and provost. Prior service credit shortens a probationary period by the amount of the credit. The Department discourages these requests because if granted it is irrevocable except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor in the tenure-track include:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.
- Early evidence of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by the initial development of a body of research, scholarship, and creative work. In addition, evidence must be provided that supports a candidate's potential for an independent program of scholarship or leadership within a productive research program as well as a strong likelihood of independent extramural research funding or extramural funding through team science work.
- 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 [Appendix B].
- In aggregate, accomplishments related to the above criteria should be sufficiently compelling that the appointee is judged to have significant potential to attain tenure and a distinguished record as a faculty member in the Department of Radiology.

Appointment: Associate Professor with Tenure on the Tenure Track

Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with tenure, require prior approval of the University Office of Academic Affairs. Criteria for appointment to the rank of associate professor with tenure are identical to the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, as detailed in Section VI of this document. In general, appointments at the rank of associate professor shall not entail a probationary period unless there are compelling reasons not to offer tenure.

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

Appointment: Associate Professor in Advance of Tenure on the Tenure Track

While appointments to the rank of associate professor on the tenure-track typically include tenure, a probationary period can be granted after petition to the University Office of Academic Affairs. The

department will exercise care in making these appointments and provide the metrics that the faculty member must achieve to be awarded tenure. For faculty without significant clinical responsibilities the probationary period may not exceed four years. For faculty with significant clinical responsibilities, the probationary period may not exceed six years. Requests for such appointments require the approval of the Dean of the College of Medicine, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

An appointment to the rank of associate professor in advance of tenure is probationary. During a probationary period, a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Criteria for appointment to the rank of associate professor in advance of tenure are identical to the criteria for promotion to associate professor in advance of tenure, as detailed in Section VI of this document.

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

Appointment: Professor with Tenure on the Tenure Track

Appointment offers at the rank of professor require prior approval of the University Office of Academic Affairs. Criteria for initial appointment to the rank of professor with tenure are identical to the department's and College of Medicine's criteria for promotion to professor with tenure, as detailed in Section VII of this document.

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

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

2 Clinical Faculty

In the Department of Radiology, clinical faculty are equivalent in importance to tenure-track faculty. The clinical faculty are those 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 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, clinical informatics, 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). Faculty members appointed to the clinical faculty may choose to distinguish themselves through several portfolios of responsibility including clinician educator, clinician scholar, and clinical excellence pathways.

The clinician educator pathway may reflect excellence as an educator as measured by teaching evaluations and innovative teaching practices and curricula or modules development, 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 or societal leadership.

The clinician scholar pathway reflects excellence in basic science, translational science, clinical research, and/or health services research (e.g., public health care policy, outcomes, and comparative effectiveness research) as measured by publications and grant funding, respectively.

The clinical excellence pathway exists for faculty members who focus on exemplary clinical care or unique areas of emphasis in patient management. These faculty members may build signature clinical programs and/or serve as preferred providers developing a regional or national reputation for clinical service expertise. Faculty members on this pathway typically devote the majority of their effort (80% or more) to patient care or departmental administrative service.

Faculty members on the clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters of tenure-track faculty.

All appointments of faculty members to the clinical faculty are made in accordance with Chapter 7 of the *Rules for University Faculty 3335-7*. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the Department, and the mission and values of the College of Medicine and University. All faculty members have access to all pertinent documents detailing the Department of Radiology, College of Medicine, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. The most updated documents are located on the University [Office of Academic Affairs](#) website.

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom an appointment is limited to three years, the initial appointment for all other clinical faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. The initial appointment at all ranks is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year if they will be reappointed for another year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary appointment, the faculty member will be informed as to whether they will be reappointed. In the event that a reappointment is not extended, the final year of the probationary appointment the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new appointment will be extended. In addition, the terms of the appointment may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment. Second and subsequent appointments for clinical faculty must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Furthermore, each appointee must obtain the appropriate Ohio licensure and other required certifications, including medical staff privileges, if required, for successful execution of their faculty responsibilities.

The Department follows the process for reappointment according to procedures set forth in the Policy on [Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure Review, and Reappointment](#), III, A-G.

The Pattern of Administration of the Department of Radiology describes the governance rights to be extended to its clinical faculty.

The following paragraphs outline the basic criteria for initial appointments to the clinical faculty.

Appointment: Clinical Instructor

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

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

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

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

Candidates for appointment to the rank of instructor on the clinical faculty at a minimum will have:

- Anticipated receipt of an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or anticipated completion of clinical residency.
- Evidence of potential for contributions to scholarship, education, or patient care.
- Post-doctoral clinical training in an appropriate area.
- 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 [Appendix B]
- No ongoing negative behaviors such as discrimination, bullying, harassment, retaliation, or promotion of other hostile work conditions.

Appointment: Assistant Clinical Professor

Candidates for appointment at this rank are expected to have completed all relevant training, including residency and fellowship where appropriate, consistent with the existing or proposed clinical or educational program goals of the Department.

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

This is the appropriate level for initial appointment of persons holding the appropriate terminal degree and the relevant clinical training (completion of residency and/or fellowship).

Candidates for appointment to the rank of assistant clinical professor will have at a minimum:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience; and completion of requisite post-doctoral clinical training.
- Evidence of contributions to scholarship, education, community engagement or patient care and the potential to advance through the faculty ranks.
- 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 [Appendix B]
- No ongoing negative behaviors such as discrimination, bullying, harassment, retaliation, or promotion of other hostile work conditions

Appointment: Associate Clinical Professor

The criteria for initial appointment at the rank of associate clinical professor are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VI of this document.

Appointment: Clinical Professor

The criteria for initial appointment at the rank of clinical professor are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VI of this document.

3 Research Faculty

Research faculty appointments exist for individuals who focus primarily on research. These appointments are intended for individuals who will have faculty-level responsibilities in the research mission, comparable to the level of a Co-Investigator. Individuals who serve as laboratory managers or otherwise contribute to the research mission at a level comparable to that of a postdoctoral fellow should not be appointed on the research faculty but rather should be appointed as research scientists.

Appointments to the research faculty are made in accordance with Chapter 7 of the *Rules of the University Faculty 3335-7*. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the Department. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty, research faculty must comprise no more than twenty percent (20%) of the number of tenure-track faculty in the Department of Radiology. In all cases, however, the number of research faculty positions in a unit must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in the Department.

Tenure is not granted to research faculty.

Contracts will be for at least one year and no more than five years and must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, research faculty appointments will require 95% salary recovery. It is expected that the salary recovery will generally be derived from extramural funds. While salary support for research faculty may not come from dollars provided to the department from the college, the department may choose to provide funding from individual departmental faculty research funds, start-up funds, and/or departmental chair package funds to maintain the faculty member's salary at 100%. 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. Departments may determine the process for reappointment according to procedures set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure Review, and Reappointment](#), III, A-G.

Research faculty members are eligible to serve on University committees and task forces but not on University governance committees. Research faculty members also are eligible to advise and supervise graduate and postdoctoral students and to be a principal investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the graduate school as detailed in Section 13 of the [Graduate School Handbook](#).

Tenure is not granted to research faculty.

Appointment: Research Assistant Professor

Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor are as follows:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or possession of equivalent experience.
- Completion of sufficient research training to provide the basis for specific expertise for contributing to the research mission.
- An initial record of scholarship that indicates effective collaboration and contribution to peer-reviewed research, reflected by co-authorship of peer-reviewed publications, participation in team science initiatives, or funded effort on peer-reviewed grants.
- 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 [Appendix B].
- Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

Appointment: Research Associate Professor on the Research Faculty

The criteria for initial appointment to the rank of research associate professor are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VI of this document.

Appointment: Professor on the Research Faculty

The criteria for initial appointment to the rank of research professor are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VI of this document.

4 Associated Faculty

Associated Faculty, as defined in the *Rules of the University Faculty 3335-5-19* (D), include “persons with practice titles, adjunct titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles.” Persons with a tenure-track faculty title on an appointment of less than 50% FTE are associated faculty. Members of the associated faculty are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. Associated faculty appointments are for one to three years. The below titles are used for associated faculty in this Department and in the College of Medicine.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are **uncompensated** and are given to individuals who volunteer academic service to the Department for which a faculty title is appropriate and/or required. Examples of such service could include but are not limited to serving on graduate student committees or teaching and evaluating medical students. Criteria for appointment at advanced rank are the same as for promotion. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure).

Clinical Instructor of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor of Practice, Clinical Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice. An earned doctorate and the required licensure/certification in their specialty are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of associated clinical practice faculty. Associated Practice faculty appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Uncompensated appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated academic service to

the Department, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Compensated appointments are given to full time clinicians who are not appointed to the clinical or tenure-track faculty.

This category of associated faculty will have a paid appointment at OSU, OSUP (Ohio State University Physicians, Inc.), or Nationwide Children's Hospital (NCH) and requires a faculty appointment (e.g., for clinical credentialing or teaching a course). They may have another paid appointment at OSU (e.g., physician), but their faculty appointment can be unpaid. This may be appropriate to use for faculty appointments that are expected to be less than three years or for faculty who are paid through OSU, OSUP, or NCH but are 100% deployed in the community.

Associated practice rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of clinical faculty. Associated practice faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of clinical faculty.

Tenure track Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%

Individuals on the tenure-track with an appointment at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated, fall within the associated faculty. Associated tenure-track is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated tenure-track faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Faculty members on temporary leave from another academic institutions are appointed as a visiting faculty member at the same rank held in that other institution. Visiting faculty appointments may also be used for new senior rank candidates for whom the appointment process is not complete at the time of their employment. In that case the visiting rank is determined by the criteria for the appointment to which they will be ultimately employed. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years.

Returning Retiree. Faculty who have retired from the University and return in any paid appointment at the University are treated as associated faculty. 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).

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:
 - Teaching of medical students, residents, clinical fellows, undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows
 - For community physicians:
 - i. Outpatient teaching of medical students, meaningful interaction consists of supervising medical students for at least one month out of the year.
 - ii. Research: These faculty members may collaborate with a department or division in the college in research projects or other scholarly activities.

iii. Service to a department 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 [Appendix B].

Appointment: Associated Faculty at Advanced Rank

Associated faculty may be compensated or uncompensated and typically provide service to the College in the areas of research, clinical care, or education.

For **compensated associated faculty** who are principally focused on patient care, the appointment at advanced rank criteria and procedures will be identical to those for the clinical excellence pathway. For **compensated 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.

For **uncompensated associated faculty**, the criteria for appointment at advanced rank is:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Teaching and Mentoring: For associated faculty members whose principal focus is teaching and mentoring, benchmarks for appointment or reappointment at advanced rank include sustained excellence in reviews by students and residents supervised by the faculty member, teaching awards, introduction of students to new modes of practice or patient populations not previously available to learners, participation or leadership in curriculum development.

Scholarship: For associated faculty members whose principal focus is scholarship, benchmarks include participation in research projects, programs, or other scholarly activity that result in enhanced regional recognition of the College through publications, funded programs, or other means. Presentations at regional meetings or leadership or participation in regional organizations dedicated to the faculty member’s area of focused scholarship serve as further indicators of advancement to this rank. Although a record of publication is not an expectation for associated faculty, publications or other forms of dissemination of scholarship (e.g., web-based documents, other electronic media) are valued and contribute to advancement in rank. This is particularly true for faculty who are appointed based on their collaboration in research or other scholarly activities. Publications may be of a variety of types and are not required to be first or senior authored.

Leadership and Administration: For associated faculty members whose principal focus is service, benchmarks may include the faculty member’s membership and participation on committees or other leadership groups. Leadership of subgroups within a committee, such as a writing group, or supervision of a task force is another example of such benchmarks. There must be a sustained commitment to leadership and administration rather than a single interaction with departmental, College, or Medical Center committee or leadership group.

PROFESSOR

For associated faculty, appointment or reappointment to the rank of Professor is based not only on

sustained contributions in the faculty member's area of focus but on a more advanced stage of leadership or greater sphere of impact than that of an Associate Professor.

Teaching and Mentoring: For associated faculty members whose principal focus is teaching and mentoring, faculty appointed or reappointed to the rank of Professor will not only have the accomplishments of an Associate Professor but will also attain broader recognition for contributions through curriculum development and recognition of excellence in education. This may come in the form of regional and national teaching awards, membership and leadership in national organizations and meetings dedicated to medical education, adoption of teaching innovations and curricula introduced by the faculty member to institutions outside the College of Medicine, and invitations to speak at outside institutions. Although publications are not an expectation, publications or websites conveying the faculty member's innovations will serve as an indication for dissemination of innovation outside the College.

Scholarship: For associated faculty members whose principal focus is scholarship, the scholarly contributions of associated faculty appointed or reappointed to the rank of Professor will exceed the scope of those at the rank of Associate Professor. Benchmarks include participation in research projects, programs, or other scholarly activities that result in enhanced national recognition of the College through publications, funded programs, or other means. Authorship or co-authorship of manuscripts and participation in nationally funded programs of research are examples of benchmarks for those achieving this rank. Presentations at national meetings and membership or leadership in national organizations dedicated to the faculty member's focus of scholarship are further benchmarks.

Leadership and Administration: For associated faculty members whose principal focus is service, the faculty member appointed or reappointed to the rank of Professor will progress to senior leadership roles in the College or Medical Center. This may consist of serving as chair of committees that contribute to the growth in excellence of the College, or which have made fundamental and innovative changes in College procedures, practice or culture. There must be a record of sustained senior leadership rather than a single interaction with a College or Medical Center committee or leadership group.

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. Should the Department Chair deny the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the dean.

If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the ten 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.

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

6 Joint Appointments

Joint faculty appointments between the Department of Radiology 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.

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a [memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) (see [Faculty Appointments Policy](#), Section 1.B) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

7 Courtesy appointments

A non-salaried appointment for a university faculty member from another TIU is considered a courtesy appointment. 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. Courtesy appointments are warranted only if they are accompanied by substantial involvement in the academic and scholarly work of the department of Radiology. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

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

Candidates should be provided with information regarding the programmatic goals of the Department of Radiology, the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure and Pattern of Administration documents of the Department and of the University practice entity prior to their visit. Searches at the associate professor or professor should be made only for candidates who match very specific needs of the Department (and/or division). The structure of the search committees at these levels should be more carefully tailored to the specifics of these solicitations. All search committees must include at least one member of the specific Division. Appointments at a senior rank (associate professor and above) require a vote of the Eligible Faculty and external letters of evaluation.

The following sections provide general guidelines for searches in the different faculty categories.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the [OAA-Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The Dean or designee of the College provides approval for the Department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise. 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 the offer involves senior rank (associate professor or above), solicitation of external letters of evaluation is required and follows the same guidelines as for promotion reviews. The eligible faculty members must also 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.

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

2 Clinical Faculty

Searches for initial appointments for clinical faculty should follow the same procedures as those utilized by the Department and the College of Medicine for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate is not required to give a presentation. A national search is required to ensure a broad pool of highly qualified candidates for all clinical faculty positions. As above, faculty appointed to the clinical faculty should evidence a career consistent with the values of the College and aligned with its cultures.

3 Research Faculty

Searches for initial appointments in the research faculty should follow the same procedures as those utilized by the Department and the College of Medicine for tenure-track faculty. As for candidates for appointment to the tenure-track faculty, it is recommended that research faculty candidates make a presentation to learners and faculty regarding their scholarship. A national search is required to ensure a broad pool of highly qualified candidates for all research faculty positions. As above, faculty appointed to this track should evidence a career consistent with the values of the College and aligned with its cultures.

4 Transfers: Track and TIU

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

Transfer: Tenure-Track to Clinical Faculty

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

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

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

Transfer: Tenure-Track to Research Faculty

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

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

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

Transfer: Clinical or Research to Tenure-Track

Transfer from the clinical faculty or research faculty to the tenure-track is not permitted, but clinical and research faculty are eligible to apply for tenure-track positions through a competitive national search. The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities.

Transfer: Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU Transfer)

Following consultation with 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 professor-clinical is transferring, the eligible faculty are all tenured associate professors and professors and all non-probationary associate clinical professors and clinical professors).

Approval of the transfer by the Office of Academic Affairs 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 the Office of Academic Affairs, 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.

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

6 Associated Faculty

The appointment of **compensated associated faculty** members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department Chair based on recommendation from the search committee. Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years.

Appointments to an **uncompensated (unpaid) associated faculty** position require no formal search process. Uncompensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of 1-3 years. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the Department and is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the APT committee.

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

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

8 Joint Appointments

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

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

9 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any Department of Radiology faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. The Department Chair, in consultation with faculty, reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

The department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure-Review, and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment.

According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

The Department Chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the Department Chair. The Department Chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

In all cases, accountability for the annual review process resides with the Department Chair.

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the 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.
- Per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#), the Department Chair will 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.

The dean must assess an annual performance and merit review when the Department Chair has submitted 1) a Report of Non-Renewal of Probationary Appointment of Faculty; 2) the fourth-year review of a probationary faculty member; 3) a Report of Contract Renewal or Non-Renewal for a clinical faculty or research faculty. In each of these roles, the decision of the dean is final.

A Documentation

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

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (required for probationary faculty)
- Most updated CV
- Department of Radiology Annual Review Form

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

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

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

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

If the Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The 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 provided).

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

1. Fourth Year Review

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

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

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

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

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's 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.

In all cases, the dean or their designee independently evaluates all faculty in their fourth year of probationary appointment and will provide the Department Chair with a written evaluation of the candidate's progress.

2. 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 the Tenure Clock

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

C Annual Review Procedures: [Tenured Faculty](#)

Accountability for the annual review process resides with the Department Chair.

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or designee, who conducts an independent assessment; may meet 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 may meet 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 of Radiology, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their clinical work, scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in education in both teaching and mentoring trainees and students; and outstanding service to the Department, the College, the University, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their clinical and 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 an associate professor or 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.

In accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.5](#), tenured faculty must undergo a post-tenure review if one of three conditions is met:

- A tenured faculty member receives a rating of “does not meet expectations” in the same area on their annual performance evaluation in at least two of the past three consecutive annual reviews;
- A tenured faculty member receives a rating of “does not meet expectations” in any area on their annual performance evaluation in the two years following the conclusion of a previous post-tenure review; or
- The Department Chair, Dean, or Executive Vice President and Provost determines that the tenured faculty member has a documented and sustained record of significant underperformance outside of their annual review; for this purpose, for cause may not be based on a faculty member's allowable expression of academic freedom as defined by the university or Ohio law.

D Annual Review and Reappointment Procedures: [Clinical Faculty](#)

The annual performance and merit 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. A subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written review if asked by the Department Chair. Accountability for the annual review process resides with the Department Chair.

In the penultimate year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. The reappointment review during the probationary period (i.e. initial term) requires either a dossier or a complete CV which is reviewed by the committee of eligible faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract. If renewing the appointment, the decision of the Department Chair is final. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be the terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

The reappointment review of a non-probationary faculty member requires either a dossier or a complete CV that is reviewed by the Department Chair. If renewing the appointment, the decision of the Department Chair is final. The decision by the Department Chair to not renew a non-probationary faculty member triggers a review by the Department APT Committee per the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure-Review, and Reappointment](#). The Dean makes the final decision on non-renewal.

E Annual Review and Reappointment Procedures: [Research Faculty](#)

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

For subsequent reappointments, the reappointment review requires a dossier or a complete CV to be submitted to the Chair. External letters of evaluation are not solicited.

There is no presumption of renewal of contract. For faculty in one- and two-year appointment terms, the Department will ensure these faculty receive the appropriate review and notification according to their term. The decision by the Department Chair to renew is final.

The decision by the Department Chair to not renew a non-probationary faculty member triggers a review by the Department APT committee per the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure-Review, and Reappointment](#). The Dean makes the final decision on non-renewal.

F Annual Review Procedures: [Associated Faculty](#)

Compensated associated faculty members must be reviewed annually before reappointment.

Initial Appointment:

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 decision is to renew, the Department Chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Multiple Year Appointment:

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 their performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the Department Chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The Department Chair's decision on reappointment is final.

Uncompensated

When considering the reappointment of uncompensated associated faculty members, at minimum their contribution to the department must be assessed on an annual basis and documented in the individual's personal file. This may take the form of self-evaluation. Neither a formal written review nor meeting is required.

G Salary Recommendations

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

Merit salary increases and other rewards made by the department will be made consistent with this AP&T document requirements and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations for non-FGP faculty, performance will be evaluated based on continuing productivity in a scaled manner (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. The Department Chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations. For clinical faculty, salary and raises are determined according to the Faculty Group Practice (FGP) Compensation plan.

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

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

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

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

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Outlined below are the Department's formal criteria for academic advancement, including promotion in each faculty category and awarding of tenure, if applicable.

The Department will conduct due diligence to verify that the candidate's qualifications meet or exceed applicable criteria prior to submitting the dossier for review and endorsing promotion and tenure recommendations.

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. It is recognized that these positive attributes characterize the ability of a faculty member to effectively contribute to exemplary scholarship, teaching, and service. A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#) (Appendix B).

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

Annually, the University Office of Academic Affairs establishes specific guidelines, procedures, and schedules for the review of candidates for promotion and tenure. The College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs also establishes and communicates the latest date for the receipt of dossiers for annual consideration by the College. Upon receipt of a candidate's dossier, the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs will submit the dossier to the College's Promotion and Tenure Committee for formal review. The committee will review the dossier, consistent with responsibilities described in Section VI.B.5 of this document and convey to the Dean in writing a recommended action to be taken. The Dean will consider the recommendations of the committee and will convey, in writing, a recommended action to the executive vice president and provost.

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

The purpose of a review by the College of Medicine Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee includes determination of whether the Department of Radiology has conducted its review and reached a recommendation consistent with University, College, and Departmental standards, criteria, policies, and rules. In addition, determination where the weight of the evidence lies in cases in which there is not a clear or consistent recommendation from the Department of Radiology is made. If the conclusion of the College-level review is that the recommendation of the unit is not consistent with University, College, and Departmental standards, criteria, policies, and rules, the Dean may make a recommendation that is contrary to the recommendation of the Department of Radiology.

Defining Impact for Promotion for Tenure Track and Clinical Faculty

Fundamental to promotion in all faculty appointment types (e.g., clinical, research, tenure track) are the totality of the impact of a candidate's body of work and the candidate's upward trajectory over time. Impact refers to the direct effect of one's work on science, education, medicine, healthcare, and/or community. The clinician educator and clinician scholar pathways, research faculty and tenure-track emphasize scholarly achievements, but the nature of scholarly activity, level of engagement, and measures of impact are specific to faculty appointment types and pathways within those appointment types. Community engagement will be carefully considered and refers to institutional, local, national, and international community contributions that are closely aligned with and complementary to a candidate's scholarly work.

The elements below highlight examples of how **impact** can be demonstrated. This is not intended to be a checklist of required contributions needed to achieve promotion. The biographical narrative should encapsulate the candidate's own description of demonstrated impact for the achievements listed.

Scholarly Activity

Fundamental to promotion in the clinician educator and clinician scholar pathways, research faculty and tenure-track is evidence of continuous scholarly productivity and an evaluation of the totality of the impact of a candidate's body of work. Any area of research consistent with the mission of the Department and the College of Medicine (COM) is acceptable as long as impact and an upward trajectory of a candidate's achievements over time can be demonstrated. The nature of scholarly activity may also differ between faculty appointment types and pathways. For the clinician educator pathway, for example, scholarly activity typically focuses on the scholarship of education, including but not limited to innovative teaching and educational practices, delivery methods, and/or interventions, instructional design, and curriculum development. For the clinician scholar pathway, scholarly activity typically reflects translational sciences, clinical research, and/or health services research. For all faculty appointment types and pathways, demonstration of impact entails providing evidence of successful translation of new knowledge into new approaches, techniques, devices, programs, etc. and may include:

- Peer reviewed research papers, assessed by
 - Citations of published peer-reviewed work
 - Contribution to published peer-reviewed work
 - Authorship of published peer-reviewed work
 - Impact/quality of journals in which peer-reviewed work is published.
- Grant funding from federal, industry, foundation, and private sources
- Academic awards
- Participation in grant review study sections, organizing committees, etc.
- Editorial leadership roles
- External lectures and invited talks

- Patents and commercialization aligned with primary research program.
- Identifiable contributions to collaborative research/team science

Teaching

Promotion in the clinical faculty and tenure-track is in part a recognition of the totality of the impact of a candidate's educational activities as measured by high quality engagement and sustained excellence. Promotion to professor requires ongoing engagement and demonstrated excellence in education.

High Quality Engagement

- Teaching in any of the defined categories of education within and outside of the COM.
- Leadership roles in teaching or educational programs.
- Innovation or novel application in local classroom teaching methods.
- Development of new educational products such as curriculum, assessment tools or programs, policy statements, technologies such as simulation, etc.
- Development of new Masters or Doctoral degree programs.
- Leading or substantive participation in education-related committees.
- Involvement in local mentoring programs, and outreach programs that promote health equity.
- Participation in CME, research, and inter-professional meetings.
- Participation in the development of scholarly products related to education.

Excellence in Education

- Internal and external evaluations of teaching.
- Outcomes of successful mentorship such as scholarly products, regional and national presentations by trainees/mentees, trainee/mentee career trajectory, etc.
- Course or program evaluations that reflect educational leadership roles.
- Awards for teaching, mentoring, and other education contributions.
- Invited lectures to disseminate new knowledge related to successful education programs, interventions, curricula that have been generated by the candidate.
- Grant funding or scholarship specifically related to education activities.
- National leadership roles in education/training committees and professional societies.

Clinical Service

For faculty who have clinical responsibilities, impact may be demonstrated as a result of:

- Contribution to the development of innovative clinical approaches to diagnosis, treatment or prevention of disease, applications of technologies and/or models of care delivery that influence care (e.g., community-based programs, clinical care models, practice guidelines, innovative application of existing or new technology, etc.)
- Service on committees in the candidate's area of clinical expertise with contributions to development of practice guidelines or policies for health equity, clinical management, evaluating clinical programs, etc.
- Leadership roles in professional organizations, courses or programs related to clinical expertise.
- Invitations to share expertise through invited talks, book chapters, clinical reviews.
- Awards for contributions and/or innovation in the area of clinical expertise.
- Regional, national, and international patient referrals.
- Engagement/collaboration in clinical trials and clinical studies.

- Clinical awards (e.g., OSU Mazzaferri-Ellison Society of Master Clinicians, Department Awards etc.)

For faculty without clinical responsibilities, impact may be demonstrated as a result of:

- Appointment to, election to, or leadership of Divisional, Departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups.
- Service on Departmental or College of Medicine GME committees.
- Service on Department or COM APT committee.
- Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee.

Consideration will be given for the demonstration of impact via non-traditional methodologies including social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics. Digital scholarship impact may be demonstrated by:

- Highlighting the number of mentions, likes, shares, and comments research receives on social media platforms.
- Showcasing the number of times research articles have been downloaded or viewed on publisher websites or repositories.
- Mentioning any significant spikes in downloads, indicating periods of increased interest.
- Providing evidence of online discussions about research on academic forums, blogs, or other online communities.
- Demonstrating societal impact by noting media coverage of research. If covered by news outlets, blogs, or other media sources, include links or references to these articles.
- Noting citations of research in policy documents, reports, or guidelines, emphasizing these instances as indicators of real-world impact.
- Showcasing collaborations that have emerged as a result of your research, especially those initiated or strengthened through online engagement.
- Highlighting any invitations to speak at conferences, webinars, or other events facilitated by digital presence.
- Noting the Altmetric Attention Score for publications, which provides a single, comprehensive indicator of online attention.
- Highlight the number of times research has been downloaded and shared, showcasing its accessibility and reach.
- Including metrics related to alternative scholarly outputs, such as datasets, software, or multimedia content associated with research.

Resources for non-traditional evidence of impact/reputation

Information on creating impact statements with Altmetric data may be found here.

Cabrera D, Vartabedian BS, Spinner RJ, Jordan BL, Aase LA, Timimi FK. *More Than Likes and Tweets: Creating Social Media Portfolios for Academic Promotion and Tenure*. J Grad Med Educ. 2017 Aug;9(4):421-425. doi: 10.4300/JGME-D-17-00171.1. PMID: 28824752; PMCID: PMC5559234.

Husain A, Repanshek Z, Singh M, Ankel F, Beck-Esmay J, Cabrera D, Chan TM, Cooney R, Gisondi M, Gottlieb M, Khadpe J, Repanshek J, Mason J, Papanagnou D, Riddell J, Trueger NS, Zaver F, Brumfield E. *Consensus Guidelines for Digital Scholarship in Academic Promotion*. West J Emerg Med. 2020 Jul 8;21(4):883-891. doi: 10.5811/westjem.2020.4.46441. PMID: 32726260; PMCID: PMC7390542

It is important to provide context and interpretation for the data presented. These non-traditional metrics do not in and of themselves demonstrate the impact of research.

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 awarding of tenure is an acknowledgment of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It requires evidence of consistent achievement throughout the professional life of the faculty member. 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. Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure occurs when a faculty member exhibits convincing evidence of excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated by a national level of impact and recognition of scholarship. In addition, excellence in teaching and service is required, but alone is not sufficient for promotion and awarding of tenure. The quality of these activities should be demonstrable at the College, University and/or national levels and be consistent with the College's values. Faculty being promoted to associate professor should exhibit professionalism and foster a safe and collaborative work environment.

These three key areas of achievement: scholarship, teaching, and service, are individually discussed below. 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 (Appendix B). **Achievement of national recognition and impact is a prerequisite for promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure.**

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.

TEACHING and MENTORING

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.

Examples of Expectations

Examples of Evidence/Documentation

<p>A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 are highly valued but not required. • 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. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
---------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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.**

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
<p>Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, or proceedings. • Development of innovative programs or imaging techniques, theoretical insight, innovative interpretation of an existing body of knowledge, clinical science, team science, laboratory investigation, quality improvement, public health and community research, implementation science, and diffusion research, among many potential others.
<p>A sustained record or scholarly productivity, reflected in both quantity and quality of publications (required)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15-25 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an assistant professor (Required, however, specific metrics in support of excellence may be adjusted <u>within</u> the range of 15-25 peer-reviewed manuscripts based on the overall pattern of the faculty member's responsibilities). Overall impact of scholarship is important. • High impact and positive trajectory of scholarship • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 the 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. • 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.
<p>Obtaining a national recognition and impact for a program of scholarship (<i>required</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of sustained or multiple external peer-reviewed grant support • 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, Almetrics scores) [See Defining Impact above]. • The above support the demonstration of national recognition and impact but this list is not comprehensive. • Materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact.
<p>Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research, or team science</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurship with patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials technology commercialization. • Innovation demonstrated by designing/supervising construction of creative products (e.g., technologies, devices, software, algorithms) that advance health-related science/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. • 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 award. • Entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion and tenure dossier.
Evidence of <u>sustained or multiple</u> external peer reviewed grant support, national foundation awards, or large-scale industry collaborations (<i>required</i>)	<p>Candidates <u>without</u> significant clinical responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must have obtained NIH (or comparable) funding as a principal investigator (PI) or Multiple Principal Investigator (MPI) on a R01, P01, U54, or K award or other comparable funding, including but not limited to NSF, DoD, USDA, AHRQ, DARPA, RWJF, Commonwealth Fund, or Kaiser Family Foundation (required). • They should have (required) demonstrated sustainability of their research program by renewal of the award and/or by garnering a second distinct nationally competitive, peer reviewed grant. The latter may include support from prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., American Heart Association, American Lung Association, American Diabetes Association, American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, the March of Dimes, etc.), a major industry grant, or other federal entities such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,

	<p>Department of Defense and the National Science Foundation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some circumstances, (e.g. specific techniques) faculty member's expertise may not justify PI level status. In such cases serving as a co-investigator on multiple grants will satisfy the requirement for extramural funding. <p>Candidates <u>with</u> significant clinical responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must obtain extramural NIH or comparable funding as defined in the previous paragraph as a PI, or MPI to support their research program prior to their mandatory tenure review (required). • Competitive, peer-reviewed career development award funding, such as an NIH K award or national foundation career development award, is acceptable. • Depending on the extent of clinical responsibilities, sustained funding through pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies for investigator-initiated proposals is acceptable. • However, serving as the site-PI for a multi-center trial <u>would not</u> satisfy the expectation for extramural funding on the tenure-track. • Faculty members who generate support for their research programs through creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding. • In rare circumstances, a faculty member's expertise may not justify principal investigator level status. In such cases serving as a co-investigator on <u>multiple grants</u> will satisfy the requirement for 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. **Required elements are noted.**

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Administrative service to the Department, COM, or University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment to, election to, or leadership of Departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups.
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical program development or enhancement • Innovative techniques or programs that advance the mission of the University or hospital, such as creation of service or imaging technique. • Design and implementation of a novel program to improve health equity.
Professional service to the field of Radiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. • Performing journal reviews.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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, YouTube, podcasts) to promote community engagement advocacy and awareness.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2 Promotion to Associate Professor in Advance of Tenure

For faculty with significant clinical responsibilities, promotion to associate professor in advance of tenure is available with an eleven-year probationary period. For these cases, promotion and tenure can be uncoupled. The criteria for promotion to Associate Professor in Advance of Tenure will require a level and pattern of achievement that demonstrates that the candidate is making significant progress towards tenure but has not yet achieved all the requisite criteria for promotion with tenure. Specifically, the candidate must (required) demonstrate evidence of an emerging national recognition.

The Department of Radiology may propose a faculty member for promotion consideration (in advance of 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. If a clinician candidate is promoted in advance of tenure, the tenure review must occur within six years, and no later than the mandatory review year, whichever comes first.

TEACHING and MENTORING	
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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, and national peers (<i>required</i>). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member’s contribution and the impact of these efforts. • Teaching awards and other honors are highly valued but not required. • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are valued. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Clear trend of outstanding or improving teaching evaluations. • Evaluations of presentations at other academic institutions, scientific or professional societies, or other health care organizations. • Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p align="center">SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH</p>	
<p align="center">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.</p>	
<p align="center">Examples of Expectations</p>	<p align="center">Examples of Evidence/Documentation</p>
<p>Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, or proceedings. • Development of innovative programs or imaging techniques, theoretical insight, innovative interpretation of an existing body of knowledge, clinical science, team science, laboratory investigation, quality improvement, public health and community research, implementation science, and diffusion research, among many potential others.
<p>Substantial progress toward the establishment of a thematic program of scholarship</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and increasing number of peer-reviewed publications as first or senior author or evidence as a key/indispensable co-author. • 10-15 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an assistant professor (required) • High impact and positive trajectory of scholarship • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Book chapters or reviews alone or in the 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. • 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.
Emerging national recognition (<i>required</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations to serve as ad hoc journal reviewer. • Invited lectures outside of the University. • 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, Almetrics scores) [See Defining Impact above]
Promising trajectory in extramural funding (<i>required</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

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. **Required elements are noted.**

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Administrative service to the Department, COM, or University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Service on Department or COM APT committee.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee.
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 health equity.
Professional service to the field of Radiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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, YouTube, podcasts etc.) to promote community engagement advocacy and awareness.

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 general criteria for promotion in scholarship, teaching and service require more advanced and sustained quantity, quality, and impact than that required for promotion to associate professor. Importantly, the standard for external reputation is substantially more rigorous than for promotion to associate professor with tenure. This record of excellence must be evident from activities undertaken and accomplishments achieved since being appointed or promoted to the rank of associate professor.

It is expected that the faculty member will have a consistent record of high-quality publications with demonstrated impact well beyond that required for promotion to associate professor. Faculty being promoted to professor should exhibit professionalism, positive values and foster a safe and collaborative work environment.

TEACHING and MENTORING

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.

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding 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, • Training program directorship, teaching awards, and organization of national course and curricula and participation in specialty boards. • Active participation in student or trainee teaching. • Candidates with clinical duties should demonstrate consistent and effective teaching of trainees and practicing clinicians, and leadership in the administration of clinical training programs. • Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
Mentorship of junior faculty (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just <i>ad hoc</i> coaching. • Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their mentorship (achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations). • Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K- awards. • 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.

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, or proceedings. • Development of innovative programs or imaging techniques, theoretical insight, innovative interpretation of an existing body of knowledge, clinical science, team science, laboratory investigation, quality improvement, public health and community research, implementation

	<p>science, and diffusion research, among many potential others.</p>
<p>A sustained record or scholarly productivity, reflected in both quantity and quality of publications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-35 peer-reviewed publications since promotion to associate professor (Required, however, specific metrics in support of excellence may be adjusted <u>within</u> the range of 20-35 peer-reviewed manuscripts based on the overall pattern of the faculty member's responsibilities). Overall impact of scholarship is important. • The pattern of scholarship should include a substantial proportion of publications as senior or corresponding author, but importance of other authorship positions as a key/ indispensable contributor is considered. (Required) • High impact and continued trajectory in their scholarly productivity. (Required) • Number of citations of their publications, the trajectory of the publication and/or citation record. • 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 the 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. • 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.
<p>Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research, and team science</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented is also valued.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurship with patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials technology commercialization. • Innovation demonstrated by designing/supervising construction of creative products (e.g., technologies, devices, software, algorithms) that advance health-related science/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.
National Leadership or International Reputation (<i>required</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) [See Defining Impact above]. • Materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact.
Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research, and team science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented is also valued. • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurship with patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials technology commercialization. • Innovation demonstrated by designing/supervising construction of creative products (e.g., technologies, devices, software, algorithms) that advance health-related science/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. 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)	<u>Candidates without significant clinical responsibilities:</u>

- At a minimum, candidates for promotion to professor who do not have clinical responsibilities must be a PI or multiple-PD/PI on at least one NIH funded R01 or equivalent grant (e.g. but not limited to National Science Foundation, 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 Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and others.
(Required)
- Must have history of at least one competitive renewal and another nationally competitive grant, or have simultaneous funding on two NIH R01 level awards (**required**). This may include support from prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., Examples include the RSNA R&E Foundation, American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, a major industry grant, or other federal entities.)
- In some circumstances (e.g. specific techniques), a faculty member's expertise may not justify PI level status. In such cases serving as a co-investigator on multiple NIH grants will satisfy the requirement for extramural funding.

Candidates with significant clinical responsibilities:

- Must obtain extramural NIH or comparable funding as defined above as a PI or MPI to support their research program.
- Depending on the extent of clinical responsibilities, sustained funding through pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies for investigator-initiated proposals is acceptable.
- Serving as the site-PI for a multi-center trial would not satisfy the expectation for extramural funding on the tenure track.
- Faculty members who generate support for their research programs through creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding. In some circumstances, (e.g., specific techniques) faculty member's expertise may not justify PI level status.
- In such cases serving as a co-investigator on multiple NIH grants will satisfy the requirement for 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 COM values.

Required elements are noted.

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Administrative leadership in the Department, COM, or University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of Departmental, COM, hospital, or University committees, working groups, divisions, or centers
Professional service or provision of expertise outside the institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership roles in professional organizations • Journal editorships • Roles as a board examiner, membership on a subspecialty board • Service on panels and commissions, program development • Professional consultation to industry, government, and education
Innovative program development that advances the mission of the Department, COM, University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation and sustenance of a program to increase access and deliver radiology services to the community.
Excellent patient care (if applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 health equity.
Professional service to the field of Radiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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, youtube, podcasts etc.)

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.

4 Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members typically pursue careers as clinician scholars, clinician educators or clinical practitioners and innovators (excellence).

Clinical faculty members on the Clinician Educator and Clinician Scholar pathways primarily direct their effort towards clinical responsibilities, including but not limited to patient care, clinical administrative responsibilities, bedside and clinical teaching, and clinical scholarship. Scholarship for clinical faculty is no less important but is often of different forms and domains of emphasis than for those in the tenure track. Clinical faculty members on the Clinical Excellence pathway ordinarily dedicate 80% effort towards clinical responsibilities, including but not limited to patient care and bedside and clinical teaching and clinical care administrative responsibilities. Clinical faculty members are not eligible for tenure.

With the exception of the Clinical Excellence Pathway, the awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor on the clinical faculty must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor.

A) Associate Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway

Promotion to associate clinical professor on the clinician educator pathway is based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a level of impact and recognition as a clinician educator since being appointed to the rank of assistant clinical professor. 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 continuing medical education programs.

TEACHING and MENTORING	
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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Longitudinal record of teaching and mentoring excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive evaluations by learners including students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, or national peers (required). The dossier must document the faculty member’s contribution and the impact of these efforts, with formal peer-review and teaching evaluations. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors are highly valued but not required. • Potential venues for teaching excellence range from traditional lecture formats to workstation instruction to digital materials, including social and digital media-based education.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
Favorable impact on teaching and training programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Changes to improve teaching or mentoring strategies/techniques.

The clinician educator must sufficiently contribute to scholarship, research, and academics to develop a national reputation and impact germane to their area of expertise.

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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence /Documentation
Contribute to scholarship, academics, and research in their area of expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed journal publications either focused on the pedagogy of education or based on their clinical expertise. Faculty in the clinician educator pathway may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain. Alternatively, other faculty members in the clinician educator pathway may publish works based on their areas of clinical expertise which form the basis for their teaching of colleagues and peers. Authorship of 10-15 peer-reviewed journal publications and other peer-reviewed scholarly works (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). Importantly, 10 or more scholarly works must have been accomplished since appointment as an assistant clinical professor. In instances where a faculty member was an assistant professor at another institution, the total volume of scholarly work will be considered in meeting the minimum requirement. 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. 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 [see Defining Impact above.] However, these non-traditional metrics do not in and of themselves demonstrate the impact of research.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications may focus on pedagogic theory, innovative teaching techniques, 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, etc. • Acquisition of grant funding from internal or external sources (federal, industry, foundation or private sources) is not required but is highly valued.
National level of impact and recognition (<i>required</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National level of impact as an educator- which can be related to either clinical expertise/scholarship, didactic education or service. This can be demonstrated through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Invited platform presentations at national organization meetings or CME meetings. ○ Leadership of or election to a national committee or organization in area of scholarship or related to education. ○ Visiting professorships at peer institutions. ○ Invitation to serve as a national board examiner.

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. **Required elements are noted.**

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Administrative service to the Department, COM, or University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 health equity.

Professional service to the field of Radiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development or expansion of initiatives that impact the field of radiology. • 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 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of initiatives that promote access to health care
Advocacy for public health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy for screening and access to care. • Funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies.
Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election to Board of Directors or other national leadership position in a public or private entity that enhances the field of Radiology.

B) Clinical Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway

The awarding of promotion to the rank of clinical professor on the clinician educator pathway, must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact as an educator or international recognition since appointment or promotion to the rank of associate clinical professor. Evidence of recognition 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.

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; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Leadership in service to this department and to the profession is encouraged but not required. Promotion will entail the generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

TEACHING and MENTORING	
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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation

Distinctive record of superlative teaching and mentoring excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding evaluations by learnings including students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, or national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts, with formal peer-review and teaching evaluations. • 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 Radiology, the Association of Academic Radiologists, and the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education committees. • Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
Mentorship of junior faculty (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered to the rank of professor. This should take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, not ad hoc career coaching. • Candidates should demonstrate evidence of mentoring or other career development activities for other faculty members. Evidence of mentoring or career development includes documented formal mentorship activities, leadership in career-development initiatives, mentees' academic promotions or awards, collaborative publications, and involvement in institutional or national mentoring committees. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Evidence of mentoring relationships with evaluations by mentees.
Favorable impact on teaching and training programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum innovation, program or course development, new teaching techniques or teaching modalities. • New methods of evaluating teaching. • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care. • Professional development in the mentoring or teaching that directly leads to improvements in teaching or programming. • Changes to improve teaching or mentoring strategies/techniques.

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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence /Documentation
Contribute to scholarship, academics, and research in their area of expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty in the clinician educator pathway may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain. Alternatively, other faculty members in the clinician educator pathway may publish works based on their areas of clinical expertise which form the basis for their teaching of colleagues and peers. • Authorship of approximately 25 to 30 peer-reviewed journal publications and other scholarly works (required).

	<p>Importantly, 15 or more must have been published since appointment as an associate clinical professor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In instances where a faculty member was an Associate Professor at another institution the volume of scholarly work completed at that institution will be considered in meeting the minimum requirement.• 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.• 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.• Social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics and consider incorporating the use of Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate's work utilizing traditional and social media platforms [see Defining Impact above] will be considered. 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, development of web-based or video-teaching modules, and podcasts for example.• 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.• Development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are considered to be published works if peer-reviewed.• 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 but not required.• There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

National reputation or international recognition (<i>required</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National or international level of impact as an educator- which can be related to either clinical expertise/scholarship, didactic education or service. • 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.
----------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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. **Required elements are noted.**

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Administrative leadership in the Department, COM, or University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of Departmental, COM, hospital, or University committees, working groups, divisions, or centers.
Professional service or provision of expertise outside the institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership roles in professional organizations. • Journal editorships. • Roles as a board examiner, membership on a subspecialty board. • Service on panels and commissions, program development. • Professional consultation to industry, government, and education.
Innovative program development that advances the mission of the Department, COM, University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community.
Advocacy for public health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy for screening and access to care. • Funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies.
Excellent patient care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 health equity.

Professional service to the field of Radiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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, YouTube, podcasts)
------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

C) Associate Clinical Professor, 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 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 and MENTORING	
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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Longitudinal record of teaching and mentoring excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive evaluations by learners including students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, or national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member’s contribution and the impact of these efforts, with formal peer-review and teaching evaluations. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors are supportive of a strong teaching record but are not required. • Programs that improve access to teaching for different populations. • Potential venues for teaching excellence range from traditional lecture formats to workstation instruction to digital materials, including social and digital media-based education. • Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).

Favorable impact on teaching and training programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum innovation, program or course development, new teaching techniques or teaching modalities. • New methods of evaluating teaching. • Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care are particularly valued. • Changes to improve teaching or mentoring strategies/techniques.
----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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.**

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence /Documentation
Contributions to scholarship; participated in basic, translational, clinical, informatics, education, or health services research projects or in clinical trials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15-20 peer-reviewed publications since appointment as an assistant professor in journals with a typical impact factor for the field of Radiology (<i>required</i>). • Importantly, 15 or more scholarly works must have been accomplished since appointment as an assistant professor at The Ohio State University. Rarely, fewer than 15 publications may result in a positive promotion review, while more than 20 may not. • In instances where a faculty member was an Assistant Professor at another institution the volume of scholarly work completed at that institution will be considered in meeting the minimum requirement. • 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 field of Radiology, impact, and originality. If these factors are all favorable, the number of publications necessary for favorable consideration might be 15. If these factors are less compelling, more might be needed. • 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. • Social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics and the use of Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate’s work utilizing traditional and social media platforms [see Defining Impact above] will be considered. However, these non-traditional metrics do not in and of themselves demonstrate the impact of research. • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of publication can be judged by calculation and presentation in the dossier of the H-index (or a similar metric). • Momentum is an important consideration. There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.
Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research, or team science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented is also valued. • 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 publications.
Acquired competitive external funding in support of their research program (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A track record of funding as a Principal Investigator or Co-investigator is required. Sources of funding include foundation, industry, or federal agencies. The Department especially values funding as principal investigator from the NIH or comparable agencies. • Creation of patents that generate licensing income or spin-off companies would meet the equivalent criteria of extramural funding.
National level of impact and recognition (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Leadership of or election to a national committee or organization.

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. **Required elements are noted.**

Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Administrative service to the Department, COM, or University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 health equity.
Professional service to the field of Radiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development or expansion of initiatives that impact the field of Radiology. • 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 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of initiatives that improve healthcare to communities.
Advocacy for public health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy for screening and access to care. • Funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies.
Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election to Board of Directors or other national leadership positions in a public or private entity that enhances the field of Radiology.

D) Clinical Professor, 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 and MENTORING	
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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation

Distinctive record of superlative teaching and mentoring excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding evaluations by learners including students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral trainees, local colleagues, or national peers (required). The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts, with formal peer-review and teaching evaluations. • Evaluations and peer feedback based on presentations and learner interactions locally at other academic institutions, or at scientific conferences. • Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Teaching and/or mentoring awards and other honors is highly valued but not required. • Participation in education and training related specialty committees, specialty societies and specialty board committees. Examples are specialty boards such as the American Board of Radiology, the Association of Academic Radiologists, and the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education committees. • Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
Mentorship of junior faculty (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered to the rank of professor. It is presumed this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just ad hoc career coaching. • Candidates must demonstrate evidence of mentoring or other career development activities for other faculty members. • While not required, active participation as a mentor in training grants such as K-awards and other such mentored programs is very highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. • Evidence of mentoring relationships with evaluations by mentees.
Favorable impact on teaching and training programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Changes to improve teaching or mentoring strategies/techniques.

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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence /Documentation
A sustained and expanded impact and national reputation for scholarship (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-30 peer- reviewed publications since appointment as an associate professor in journals with a typical impact factor for the field of radiology (required). • 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 field of Radiology, 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In instances where a faculty member was an Assistant Professor at another institution the volume of scholarly work completed at that institution will be considered in meeting the minimum requirement. • 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 demonstrates 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.). • Faculty are encouraged to avoid an excessively literal interpretation of the number of peer-reviewed publications needed for promotion. 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. • 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 of publication can be judged by calculation and presentation in the dossier of the H-index (or a similar metric). • Social media portfolios such as blog/vlog/podcast/vodcast authorship/editorial duties or professional media engagement on scholarly topics and the use of Altmetrics to assess the impact of the candidate's work utilizing traditional and social media platforms [see Defining Impact above] will be considered. However, these non-traditional metrics do not in and of themselves demonstrate the impact of research. • Momentum is an important consideration. There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time (<i>required</i>).
Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research, or team science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of collaborative scholarship with manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Middle authorship that is uniquely contributory, clear, and well documented is also valued. • 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 competitive external funding in support of their research program (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A track record of funding as a Principal Investigator, Co-investigator or collaborator is required. Sources of funding include foundation, industry, or federal agencies. The Department of Radiology especially values funding as principal investigator from the NIH or comparable agencies. • The faculty must (required) demonstrate sustainability of funding through a competitive grant renewal or garnering a second grant from the sources noted above. • 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. Required elements are noted.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Administrative service to the Department, COM, or University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of Departmental, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups. • Service on Departmental or College of Medicine GME committees. • Service on Departmental COM APT Committee. • Participation on the Institutional Review Board or Intramural Research Review Committee.
Excellent patient care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 health equity.
Professional service to the field of Radiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of, or election to, a national committee or organization. • Development or expansion of initiatives that impact the field of Radiology. • 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 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of initiatives that promote improved health care of all communities.
Advocacy for public health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy for screening and access to care. • Funding at the level of local, state, and federal agencies.

Provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Election to Board of Directors or other national leadership position in a public or private entity that enhances the field of Radiology or medicine.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

E) Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway

Faculty members with predominantly clinical or clinical administrative responsibilities may be considered for promotion based on clinical excellence. Ordinarily these faculty have 80% or greater clinical and/or clinical administrative responsibilities. These faculty are recognized for the scholarship of clinical practice or novel contributions to the advancement of the practice in their field. Local recognition for outstanding clinical care is a hallmark for promotion to associate clinical professor in the clinical excellence pathway. National recognition is not a requirement. Promotion to the rank of associate clinical professor on the clinical excellence pathway must be based upon convincing evidence for outstanding clinical outcomes, and a record of impact relating to clinical care. Additionally, a record that demonstrates a faculty member’s clinical expertise is recognized outside the OSU system through social and digital media outlets can also be used to demonstrate impact. However, these non-traditional metrics do not in and of themselves demonstrate clinical excellence. 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 overall mission of the Department, but the focus on promotion is the 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.

<p align="center">CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE CLINICAL PROFESSOR, CLINICAL EXCELLENCE PATHWAY</p> <p align="center">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.</p>	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Teaching Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not required, although participation in teaching and mentoring of trainees and early career faculty is highly valued and may be included. Evidence a faculty member participates as an instructor or is involved with the development of education activities at the state or national level that are in person, virtual, or web based. Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
Scholarship Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not required. While traditional research (e.g., clinical, translational, basic, or population health science) is not a focus of this pathway, publications or written reports demonstrating success in clinical performance (as detailed below) are valued.
Excellence in clinical performance (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstration of impact or excellence in clinical performance is the hallmark of the clinical excellence pathway (required). Quantitative quality indicators may be used, such as, but not limited to, documented low complication rates, improved turnaround times, process improvements,

	<p>improvement in health outcomes for all types of patient populations, improvements in community health outcomes and utilization management measures. Clinical productivity metrics (e.g., wRVU) per se, are not sufficient for supporting excellence in clinical performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. The development and/or leading the acquisition of new technology or new imaging service line that leads to evidence that there has been improved patient care, cost/time savings and improved accuracy. • Preferred provider recognition. Referral patterns or other metrics that indicate acknowledgment of a faculty member’s expertise such as, but not limited to, the specific request to interpret studies or perform procedures, number of cases referred specifically to candidate for a second opinion, patients referred from other states or other regions within Ohio specifically for candidate. Traditional and social media can be used to exemplify the impact of the faculty member’s excellence (e.g., Disease specific Facebook forums, X etc.) • Cultivation of referral patterns demonstrating a reputation internal and/or external to the organization as the “go-to” person—this may include referral of the most complex studies and sickest patients thus identifying physicians with unique clinical skills as exemplary in their field. • Leading successful quality improvement or systems- based efforts that improve care delivery or health care outcomes. These outcomes should be translatable or realistically adaptable to other settings locally and nationally. • Operational improvements that make practice more efficient, effective, easier to access, or more cost effective. • Documented and effective advocacy for screening and community health. • Demonstration of collaboration with researchers as a skilled clinical trial collaborator.
<p>Local and regional recognition (required)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations to speak locally, regionally or at other hospitals, academic medical centers, or statewide professional societies. • Participation in the development of clinical practice guidelines, small group activities with peer-reviewed data and internal benchmarking, and participation in web-based education, online seminars, podcasts, blogs, social media outlets and creation of educational websites relating to patient care to the extent their impact can be quantified. • Evidence that a faculty member has developed clinical innovations that have been adopted by other physicians within or outside the medical center. For example, innovations that improve delivery of care, such as developing new techniques, implementing new technology, better patient engagement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of innovative approaches to the management of a specific clinical problem that becomes a local, regional, or national standard of practice. • Participation in the development of institutional or statewide practice guidelines. • Evidence that physicians/professionals from other medical centers outside of Ohio come to OSU/NCH specifically for training by the faculty member, or request proctoring at their home institution by the faculty member. • Demonstration of the faculty member's expertise as recognized by the receipt of honors and awards from internal and external sources (OSU Medical Center and Professional Societies) • Sustained and meaningful participation and/or leadership in the Department of Radiology, the College of Medicine, The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Nationwide Children's Hospital, and local or regional, and national committees relating to clinical care.
Track record of exemplary clinical leadership and unique clinical program development at Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center/NCH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to examples above, this may include both clinical and administrative work and must be supported by written documentation such as internal letters of support from Departmental or hospital leadership and external letters of support from referring physicians or peers in the candidate's field. • Evidence of development of programs to identify healthcare disparities or programmatic changes to advance healthcare outcomes. • Evidence of the faculty member's efforts and participation in programs supporting the clinical mission or developing programs to enhance education and improve the workplace.

F) Clinical Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway

Faculty members with predominantly clinical or clinical administrative and/or leadership responsibilities may be considered for promotion based on clinical excellence. Ordinarily these faculty have 80% or greater clinical and/or clinical administrative responsibilities. These faculty have distinguished themselves by having particularly outstanding clinical work. These faculty are recognized for the scholarship of practice or novel contributions to the advancement of the practice in their field. State and national recognition for outstanding clinical care is a hallmark for promotion to professor in the clinical excellence pathway. Promotion to professor in the clinical excellence pathway must be based upon convincing evidence 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 professor. Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered to the rank of professor.

Promotion will not be granted solely on the basis of length of service to the institution, time in rank, clinical productivity, satisfactory job performance, or continuation of projects which supported the candidate's promotion to associate professor. A faculty member who qualifies for promotion on this pathway should have supportive annual evaluations that document increasing clinical impact and performance 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 CLINICAL 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. Required elements are noted.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Teaching Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding clinical mentorship of trainees (residents, fellows) with evaluations documenting the faculty member's contribution and impact of these efforts. • Evidence a faculty member participates as an instructor or is involved with the development of education activities at the state or national level that are in person, virtual, or web based. • Peer-evaluations noting excellence in clinical teaching and mentorship and guidance is required. • Mentorship of early career faculty is required with documentation of the faculty member's contribution and impact of these efforts.
Mentorship Excellence (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered to the rank of professor. This should take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, not ad hoc career coaching. • Candidates should demonstrate evidence of mentoring or other career development activities for other faculty members. Evidence of mentoring or career development includes: documented formal mentorship activities, leadership in career-development initiatives, mentees' academic promotions or awards, collaborative publications, and involvement in institutional or national mentoring committees. Achievement by direct mentees, including publications, external funding, and invited presentations. • Evidence of mentoring relationships with evaluations by mentees.
Scholarship Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not required.</i> • Demonstration of collaboration with researchers as a skilled clinical trial collaborator. • While traditional research (e.g., clinical, translational, basic, or population health science) is not a focus of this pathway, publications or written reports demonstrating success in clinical performance (as detailed below) are valued.
Excellence in clinical performance (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of impact or excellence in clinical performance is the hallmark of the clinical excellence pathway (required). • Quantitative quality indicators may be used, such as, but not limited to, documented low complication rates, improved turnaround times, process improvements, reduction in health disparities, improvements in community health outcomes and utilization management measures. Clinical productivity metrics (e.g., wRVU) per se, are not sufficient for supporting excellence in clinical performance.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The development and/or leading the acquisition of new technology or new imaging service line that leads to evidence that there has been improved patient care, cost/time savings and improved accuracy. • Preferred provider recognition. Referral patterns or other metrics that indicate acknowledgment of a faculty member’s expertise such as, but not limited to, the specific request to interpret studies or perform procedures, number of cases referred specifically to candidate for a second opinion, patients referred from other states or other regions within Ohio specifically for candidate. Traditional and social media can be used to exemplify the impact of the faculty member’s excellence (e.g., Disease specific Facebook forums, X etc.) • Cultivation of referral patterns demonstrating a reputation external to the organization as the “go-to” person -- this may include referral of the most complex studies and sickest patients thus identifying physicians with unique clinical skills as exemplary in their field. • Participation in successful quality improvement or systems-based efforts that improve care delivery or health care outcomes; these should be translatable or realistically adaptable to other settings locally and nationally. • Operational improvements that make practice more efficient, effective, easier to access, or more cost effective. • Documented and effective advocacy for screening and community health.
<p>National impact and recognition <i>(required)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations to speak regionally and nationally at hospitals, academic medical centers, and professional societies. • Participation in the development of clinical practice guidelines, small group activities with peer-reviewed data and internal benchmarking, and participation in web-based education, online seminars, podcasts, blogs, social media outlets and creation of educational websites relating to patient care to the extent their impact can be quantified. • Evidence that a faculty member has developed clinical innovations that have been adopted by other physicians within or outside the medical center. For example, innovations that improve delivery of care, such as developing new techniques, implementing new technology, better patient engagement. • Development of innovative approaches to the management of a specific clinical problem that becomes a local, regional, or national standard of practice. • Participation in the development of institutional or statewide practice guidelines. • Evidence that physicians/professionals from other medical centers outside of Ohio come to OSU/NCH specifically for

	<p>training by the faculty member, or request proctoring at their home institution by the faculty member.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of the faculty member’s expertise as recognized by the receipt of honors and awards from internal and external sources (OSU Medical Center and Professional Societies). • Sustained and meaningful leadership in the Department of Radiology, the College of Medicine, The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Nationwide Children’s Hospital, and local or regional, and national committees relating to clinical care. • Interaction with educators in the Department of Radiology, other entities at College of Medicine or beyond that directly or indirectly results in improved clinical care in a measurable manner.
Track record of exemplary clinical leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of operational improvements that make practice more efficient, effective, easier to access, or more cost effective. • In addition to the examples above, this may include both clinical and administrative work and must be supported by written documentation such as internal letters of support from Departmental or hospital leadership and external letters of support from referring physicians or peers in the candidate’s field. • Development of initiatives that improve health care of all different types of communities, Continued evidence of the increasing impact at the state or national level of programs developed to identify healthcare disparities or programmatic changes to negate the effect of inequitable healthcare delivery. • Evidence of the faculty member’s efforts and participation in programs supporting the clinical mission or developing programs to enhance education and improve the workplace. • Evidence of faculty member’s administrative leadership involves creativity, innovation, and is evaluated by outcomes. These leadership roles may include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health system leadership of patient care programs, operations, or health care finance. • Leadership at the Departmental, College, University, or national level of programs that advance disease prevention, treatment and control or faculty and staff wellness. • Leadership at the Departmental, College, University, or national level of programs that advance health equity, improvement of health care access

5 Research Faculty

The criteria for promotion focus primarily 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.

A) Research Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to research associate professor are expected to demonstrate the beginnings of national recognition of their expertise.

Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research, but rather support the investigative work of others. Research faculty typically serve as co-investigators and independent extramural funding as principal investigator or multiple principal investigator is not required. Promotion to research associate professor requires documentation of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship based upon their expertise. 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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Teaching Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not required</i>, although participation in teaching and mentoring of trainees and early career faculty is valued and may be included • Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
Service Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not required</i>
Documentation of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship based in area of expertise (required).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15-20 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. • Sustained record of 95% salary recovery (required). • Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators, and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigator) is not required. • Momentum is an important consideration. There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.
Demonstrate the beginnings of a national recognition of their expertise (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, Altmetric scores) [See Defining Impact above].

Demonstrate a commitment to College and University values,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research addressing needs in all different types of communities. • Documentation of mentoring and mentoring practices of trainees • Exhibit professionalism and foster a safe and collaborative work environment as evidenced by peer or supervisor letters or awards.
------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

B) Research Professor

Promotion to the rank of research professor must be based upon convincing evidence the candidate has established a national level of recognition and impact beyond that which was established for promotion to research associate professor. Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research.

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 (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigator) is not required. Promotion will entail the 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.	
Examples of Expectations	Examples of Evidence/Documentation
Teaching Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not required</i>, although participation in teaching and mentoring of trainees and early career faculty is valued and may be included if desired by candidate. • Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section).
Service Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not required</i>
Documentation of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship based in area of expertise (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-30 peer-reviewed journal publications since appointment as research associate professor (required). Some first, senior, or corresponding authorships are expected. On middle author publications, the candidate should document a supportive role to the project. • 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. • Sustained record of 95% salary recovery generally derived from extramural funds (required). • Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators, and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigator) is not required.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Momentum is an important consideration. There should exist a trajectory of increasing scholarly activity and outcomes over time.
National level of recognition and impact beyond what was established for promotion to associate professor (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) [See Defining Impact above].
Demonstrate a commitment to College and University values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research addressing needs in all different types of communities • Documentation of mentoring and mentoring practices of trainees • Exhibit professionalism and foster a safe and collaborative work environment as evidenced by peer or supervisor letters or awards.

6 Associated Faculty

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track and clinical faculty (see Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the College level if the Department Chair's recommendation is negative and does not proceed to the University level if the Dean's recommendation is negative.

Compensated Associated Faculty (i.e., Practice)

For compensated associated faculty (paid through OSU, OSUP, or NCH) who are principally focused on patient care, the promotion criteria and procedures will be identical to those for the clinical excellence pathway, except that the decision of the Dean is final.

For compensated associated faculty (paid through OSU, OSUP, or NCH) who contribute principally through educational activities, the promotion criteria and procedures will be identical to those for the clinician educator pathway, except that the decision of the Dean is final.

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

Uncompensated Associated Faculty (i.e., Adjunct)

For uncompensated associated faculty, promotion should reflect contributions to the Department or College that exceed the activities that represent the basis for their faculty appointment, in most cases related to the educational mission. At the associate professor level this could include service on Department and or College committees, contributions to medical student curriculum development or other

evidence of contributions to the educational or scholarly mission of the Department or College. For promotion to professor, the level of contribution must demonstrate sustained and enhanced engagement or leadership.

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.

Procedures for promotion of uncompensated associated faculty:

- a. Submission of an updated CV
- b. Letters from two people, including the faculty member's immediate supervisor (i.e., division director or clerkship director), who can attest to the associated faculty member's contributions.
- c. Teaching evaluations if available
- d. Letter from the APT Committee Chair summarizing Eligible Faculty comments and vote
- e. Letter from the Department Chair
- f. Review and approval by College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs.

B Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion Review: Procedures for Tenure Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty

The Department of Radiology's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for tenure-track faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for clinical faculty, and [3335-7-32](#) for research faculty, and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

As the Department enters new fields of endeavor, including cross disciplinary involvement, and places new emphasis on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of a faculty member may depart from established academic patterns. Generally, distinguished achievement in scholarship must include evidence of creative expression and innovation in the candidate's discipline.

The Department of Radiology comprises a wide array of professional disciplines. Care must be taken to apply the criteria for appointment and promotion with sufficient flexibility. In all instances, outstanding accomplishment in accordance with the criteria set forth, is an essential qualification for appointment and promotion to all faculty positions. The candidate for promotion should demonstrate in their career a spirit of collaboration and alignment with the values and culture of the College. Maintaining these standards for all faculty is essential to enhance the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

1 Tenure-Track, Clinical and Research Faculty

a Candidate Responsibilities

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

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#). Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs [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 Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by them. Please refer to the [APT Toolbox](#) for a wealth of information on completing a dossier.

The [time period for teaching documentation](#) to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date of employment on the faculty at OSU to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last dossier submission for promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is less (and excluding any information that may have been considered for a previous promotion), to present. The Eligible Faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

The [time period for scholarship documentation](#) to be included in the dossier is the entire duration of the faculty member's academic career (including residency or post-doctoral training). For faculty being considered for [promotion to the rank of associate professor](#), the weight of the review is **from the start date of the faculty appointment** (including time on faculty at another institution) to the present. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence over time and an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time. For faculty being considered for [promotion at the rank of professor](#), the weight of the review is **from the date of the dossier submission for the promotion to associate professor to present**. Information about scholarship produced prior to that date may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for independence and a continued trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes.

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 dossier submission for promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent. The Eligible Faculty may allow a candidate to include information from before the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

The department may allow a dossier appendix to augment evidence for teaching, clinical excellence, or scientific achievement if the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee feels this information enhances understanding of a candidate's career achievements. This appendix, however, will not be forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost for final review.

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 requested by the University Office of Academic Affairs.

- **Documentation**

Faculty members preparing their dossiers for promotion and/or tenure review should consult Chapter 3 of OAA's [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) to ensure that all required documentation is included.

The following paragraphs provide suggested standards for documenting excellence in Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service.

i. Teaching

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

All tenure-track and clinical faculty members in the Department must be engaged in teaching, development of the Department's and College's academic programs, and mentoring of students, residents, and fellows. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated by documentation of teaching activities over a sustained period of time.

Evidence for effective teaching may be collected from multiple different sources including students, residents, fellows, peers, and administrators. Yearly student evaluations, resident, and fellow evaluations (when applicable) and peer evaluations are required. **One peer evaluation is required per year.** Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated by positive evaluations from students, residents, fellows, local colleagues, and national peers. The administration of the peer assessment tool must not be under the control of the faculty member being evaluated. Faculty members may supplement the required assessment tool with others if they wish. Students, residents, and fellows must be provided an opportunity to assess the instructor and course using the required assessment tool in every regular classroom course. Faculty involved in teaching must be evaluated at a minimum once per year by trainees. Effort will be made to obtain evaluations from the largest number of students, residents, and fellows possible.

Typically, documentation of teaching for the promotion dossier should include the following items.

- 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 as required by the Department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the section IX of this document)
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including.
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other Colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching such as a teaching portfolio as appropriate

Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members. Peer evaluations may include internal and/or external review of classroom instruction, clinical teaching, and course materials such as syllabi, examinations and instructional materials including textbooks. Assessment by observation of

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

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

Other documentation of teaching may include a Department Chair or their designee assessment of the candidate's teaching load, contribution to the teaching mission of the academic unit, and contribution to curriculum development. Evidence of the success of the candidate's former students, including professional and graduate students and post-doctoral trainees, should be documented.

ii. Scholarship

Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge by research, study, learning and the scholarship of practice. This includes but is not limited to investigator initiated clinical trials and research based on cases or case series, educational outcomes research, development of academic modules, and entrepreneurship. The nature and amount of scholarship should be pertinent to the faculty member's track and pattern of responsibilities. The Department will recognize new and emerging methods of dissemination of scholarship including websites, social media, etc.

Evaluation of scholarship must be open to the ongoing evolution of new scholarly domains in the medical sciences including scholarship of community engagement. In the College of Medicine, a faculty member's scholarship must be demonstrated to be of high quality, significance, and impact. This Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document establishes how the evidence of a faculty member's scholarship will be documented and assessed in terms of quality and significance and in relationship to the expectations of the track they are in (section VI).

All tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty members (with the exception of faculty on the clinical excellence pathway) must develop a record of scholarship that is documented by a body of original scholarly work over a period of time. Scholarship is broadly defined including all aspects of basic science, clinical research including clinical trials and research based on cases or case series, scholarship of teaching and learning, development of academic modules, entrepreneurship, etc. The evidence for scholarship must refer to original, substantive works that are documented achievements. Recognition of scholarly work must also be external to the University, residing in the scientific and educational practice communities apropos to the faculty member's field of scholarship. The nature of scholarship should be pertinent to the faculty member's track and pattern of responsibilities.

Those in the clinical excellence pathway demonstrate scholarship of practice through innovations in patient care that advance disease prevention, detection, and treatment (see the criteria for the clinical excellence pathway sections).

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. Evidence of scholarship may also include 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; and invitations to serve on national review bodies.

Documentation of scholarship also includes grants and contracts submitted and received, and a 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. Although receipt of an extramural grant is meritorious, promotion also requires evidence of the impact and outcomes of the scholarly program it supports.

iii. Service

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. In the Department of Radiology, a candidate's service contributions must be demonstrated to be of high quality and effectiveness. All tenure-track and clinical faculty members must contribute to service as evidenced by documentation of contributions over a sustained period of time.

High-quality patient care is an expectation of all faculty members with clinical responsibilities, and therefore, evidence of additional service is necessary for promotion. Evidence of administrative service to the University may include appointment or election to Department, College, and/or University committees, holding administrative/leadership 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 if desired by the Department. 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. Evaluation of service should include evidence of a spirit of collegiality and collaboration with all of those in the many roles that work to advance the Department, College and its missions.

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

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

If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT 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 of Radiology.

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

Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair (or designee, e.g., Chair of the APT Committee) and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than two additional names (one for clinical excellence and clinician educator) but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The Department Chair (or designee, e.g., Chair of the APT Committee) 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 and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for non-probationary clinical and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful. Faculty in the probationary period of a tenure track, clinical, or research appointment may be denied each year of the probationary period up to the year of the mandatory review.
 - 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, the APT committee's responsibilities are to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure 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 [here](#).
- 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. The candidate should be shown the list of potential evaluators by the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair to identify any collaborators, conflicts of interest or other issues that could interfere with the objectivity of the reviews, and be invited to augment it with no more than three names of persons who meet the criteria for objective, credible, evaluators. The department may not use more than two names provided by the faculty (one for clinical excellence and clinician educator).

Summer:

- Gather internal evidence of the quality of the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service from students and peers, as appropriate, within the Department.
- Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with University 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 or communicate with each candidate for clarification of the dossier as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. These meetings or communications are not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

Late Summer:

- Establish a mechanism for each candidate's dossier to be accessible for review by the Eligible Faculty (e.g., secure website) at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to provide to the Eligible Faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.

Early Autumn:

- The Chair of the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure committee will revise the draft analysis of each case following the Eligible Faculty meeting to include the Eligible 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 tenure-initiating unit. The full Eligible Faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department’s recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on the cases of its Department.

c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

In the event that the Department does not have at least three faculty members who are eligible to conduct the review, the Department Chair must contact the College Office of Faculty Affairs to identify appropriate faculty members from other TIUs that will supplement the Eligible Faculty within the Department.

The responsibilities of the members of the Eligible Faculty 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.
- The evaluation by the Eligible Faculty is not advisory to the Department Chair but represents an independent voice of the faculty.
- The Chair of the APT Committee serves as the Chair of the Eligible Faculty and will write a letter to the Department Chair reporting the vote and summarizing the discussion of the Eligible Faculty. This letter will be evaluative as well as descriptive and comment on discussions justifying the final recommendation and vote, considering areas of

strength and areas in which there might have been greater achievement. In the event the candidate is on the tenure track, this letter must be written by a tenured faculty member at the appropriate rank per University Faculty Rules.

d Department Chair Responsibilities

In the event that the Department Chair is on the clinical faculty, and therefore ineligible to conduct the promotion evaluation of a tenure-track candidate for promotion, the Department must appoint or otherwise designate a tenured faculty member who can provide the Chair-level review. For review of candidates being considered for promotion to professor, that designee must be a tenured professor. The responsibilities of the Department Chair or designee are as follows:

- a) 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. This department will ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates 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.
- b) **Late Spring:** To designate the APT Chair to solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the APT Committee, the Chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- c) To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The Department Chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- d) To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- e) 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.
- f) Following receipt of the letter of the Eligible Faculty's completed evaluation and vote, to provide an independent written evaluation and conclusion regarding whether a candidate's dossier meets the criteria for promotion and/or tenure. In the interest of an independent evaluation, the College of Medicine discourages the Department Chair from attending the committee of eligible of faculty deliberations.
- g) To meet with the Eligible Faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- h) To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the Department review process:
 - i. of the recommendations by the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair.
 - ii. of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair.
 - iii. 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 unit head, indicating whether or not they will submit comments.
- i) To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- j) To forward the completed dossier to the College office by that office's deadline of November 1. With the exception of associated faculty, all dossiers including those with a negative

Department evaluation must be forwarded to the College. Only the faculty member may stop the review process.

- k) To receive the APT Committee'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, clinical practice faculty, and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.A 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:

- Brigham and Women's Hospital (Harvard) – Boston, Massachusetts
- Cleveland Clinic – Cleveland, Ohio
- Columbia University- New, York
- Duke University – Durham, North Carolina
- Emory University Hospital – Atlanta, Georgia
- Indiana University Health – Indianapolis, Indiana
- Johns Hopkins University – Baltimore, Maryland
- Massachusetts General Hospital (Harvard) – Boston, Massachusetts
- Mayo Clinic – Rochester, Minnesota
- Mount Sinai Hospital – New York, New York
- New York-Presbyterian Hospital-Columbia and Cornell – New York, New York
- New York University Langone Grossman School of Medicine – New York, New York
- Northwestern Medicine – Chicago, Illinois
- Stanford University – Stanford, California
- University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center – Cleveland, Ohio
- University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Medical Center – Los Angeles, California
- University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) – San Francisco, California
- University of Chicago Medicine – Chicago, Illinois
- University of Cincinnati Medical Center – Cincinnati, Ohio
- University of Florida Health – Gainesville, Florida
- University of Iowa Hospitals & Clinics – Iowa City, Iowa
- University of Kansas Health System – Kansas City, Kansas
- University of Michigan Health System – Ann Arbor, Michigan
- University of Minnesota Medical Center – Minneapolis, Minnesota
- University of Missouri Health Care – Columbia, Missouri
- University of North Carolina Hospitals – Chapel Hill, North Carolina
- University of Pennsylvania – Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- University of Pittsburgh Medical Center – Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
- University of Southern California (USC) Medical Center – Los Angeles, California

- University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center – Houston, Texas
- University of Virginia Medical Center – Charlottesville, Virginia
- University of Washington Medical Center – Seattle, Washington
- University of Wisconsin Hospital and Clinics – Madison, Wisconsin
- Vanderbilt University Medical Center – Nashville, Tennessee
- Washington University in St. Louis/Mallinckrodt Institute – St. Louis, Missouri
- Yale New Haven Hospital – New Haven, Connecticut

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

External evaluations are obtained for all promotion and/or tenure reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all clinical (with the exception of faculty seeking promotion to associate clinical professor on the clinical excellence pathway) and research faculty promotion reviews. As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the APT Committee, the Department Chair, and the candidate. Candidates are permitted to suggest external evaluator names following the criteria below. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. 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.” In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the University Office of Academic Affairs nor Departments in this College require that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a formal mentor, 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 (three for clinical excellence and clinician educator pathways). A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person who has no conflict of interest as described above and is highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with 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. They must be at the rank above the candidate being considered unless an exception has been granted by the college. It is therefore essential that the individual or body generating the list of prospective evaluators ascertain the relationship of prospective evaluators with the candidate before seeking a letter of evaluation. Candidates must be provided the opportunity to propose potential external reviewers and to review the proposed list of reviewers to identify potential conflicts. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the scholarly work.

- 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.
- In the event that a unit is unable to obtain the required number of external evaluations, the unit 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 five external letters (three for clinical excellence and clinician educator pathways) will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, AP&T Chair, and the Department Chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and agree that it will not constitute a procedural error. Faculty on the clinical excellence pathway moving to Associate Clinical Professor may have three internal letters of evaluation; faculty moving to Clinical Professor should have at least one external letter of evaluation out the three total letters.

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for clinical/teaching/professional practice faculty can be found [here](#).

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

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

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. 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. Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision. 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 head of the Department 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 document, by a Department and the College's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College, (2) the *Rules of the University Faculty*, (3) the 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 of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Department of Radiology views teaching broadly. It includes teaching in the classroom, at the bedside or workstation, or in the research laboratory. If appropriate, faculty in the COM can make use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) or can use any other appropriate method of student evaluation of their teaching. Faculty are also reviewed regularly by residents and/or fellows using appropriate online evaluation systems. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department Chair oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process which is implemented by the Vice Chair for Radiology Education. A teaching peer evaluation is performed at least once per year for each faculty member using a standardized form. The teaching moment may include a didactic lecture, online lecture, board review session, one-on-one review session of a resident or fellow readout or any other teaching opportunity. The form addresses knowledge, engagement, and opportunity for interaction, presentation, and effectiveness. 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. Reviews conducted upon the request of the Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the Chair or faculty member and may or may not include class or real-time teaching visitations.

X [Appendices](#)

APPENDIX A – Key Definitions & 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 (APT) Committee – the body of faculty that makes recommendations to the Department Chair or Dean regarding the viability of candidates for appointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) 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, returning retirees, and lecturers that are typically intended to be short term appointments (See also Adjunct Faculty, Practice Faculty).

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 (formally known as Exclusion of Time) – the ability to have up to three years added to the time clock toward achieving tenure.

Faculty – the College of Medicine has four faculty types: Tenure-track, clinical faculty, research faculty, and 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, professionalism, and DEI.

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 (University).

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. See also reappointment review below.

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 clinical service responsibilities). It is also defined as the first appointment term for faculty on the Clinical faculty or Research faculty. Once they have been reappointed, they are no longer probationary. During the probationary period, faculty are reviewed annually and informed whether their appointment will be continued.

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 diverse 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, research, or associated faculty member in the penultimate year of their contract to determine if the contract will be renewed. See also penultimate year above.

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

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

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.

SEI – Student Evaluation of Instruction.

Tenure – permanent employment status only granted to faculty on the tenure-track when the probationary period is successfully completed.

Department – Tenure Initiating Unit, synonymous with Department. Centers and Institutes are not Tenure Initiating Units (please see Appendix B for the complete list of Departments).

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.

APPENDIX B – 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.