

**Appointments, Promotion, and
Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
Department of Biological Chemistry
and Pharmacology**

Approved by the Faculty: February 21, 2024

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: September 9, 2024

Table of Contents

I Preamble.....	4
II Department Mission	4
III Definitions	5
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1 Tenure-track Faculty	5
2 Research Faculty	5
3 Associated Faculty	6
4 Conflict of Interest.....	6
5 Minimum Composition	7
B Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees.....	7
C Quorum.....	7
D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	8
1 Appointment	8
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	8
IV Appointments	8
A Criteria.....	8
1 Tenure-track Faculty	9
2 Research Faculty	10
3 Associated Faculty.....	10
4 Emeritus Faculty	11
5 Joint Appointments	11
6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	12
B Procedures.....	12
1 Tenure-track Faculty	12
2 Research Faculty	14
3 Transfer from the Tenure Track.....	14
4 TIU Transfer	14
5 Associated Faculty.....	14
6 Joint Appointments	15
7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	15

V Annual Performance and Merit Review	15
A Documentation	16
B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	17
1 Fourth-Year Review	17
2 Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	18
C Tenured Faculty	18
D Research Faculty	18
E Associated Faculty	19
F Salary Recommendations	19
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	19
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion.....	20
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	20
2 Promotion to Professor.....	23
3 Research Faculty	27
4 Associated Faculty	27
B Procedures.....	27
1 Tenure-track and Research Faculty	27
a Candidate Responsibilities	27
b Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees Responsibilities.....	30
c Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	32
d Department Head Responsibilities	32
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty.....	33
3 External Evaluations	33
a Peer and Near Peer Institutions	33
VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	35
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews	35
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	35
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	36
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	36

I Preamble

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

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

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

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

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's [policy on affirmative action and equal employment opportunity](#).

II Department Mission

The Department of Biological Chemistry and Pharmacology is dedicated to the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge and to providing a state-of-the-art education to undergraduates, professional students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows in biochemistry, pharmacology, and related disciplines. Excellence in research, teaching, and service is considered fundamental to achieving the department's mission. The department will provide an environment for the faculty and trainees to develop their full intellectual, research and educational potential.

Department faculty are involved in diverse areas of research that are united by the goal of identifying the molecular mechanisms underlying human health and disease. The department's teaching component includes the biochemistry, pharmacology, molecular biology, and nutrition portions of the medical and health sciences programs as well as graduate training of Ph.D. students (both formal coursework and research training). Department faculty participate in, and contribute to, a number of graduate programs including the Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program (BSGP), the Ohio State Biochemistry Program (OSBP), the Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology Program (MCDB), the Biophysics Graduate Program and the Neuroscience Graduate Program (NSGP). The faculty strive to integrate research and teaching to provide the most progressive and challenging environment for trainees in both the laboratory and the classroom. Department faculty participate in service that includes work at the national and local levels in relation to professional societies and journals, peer review for granting agencies, as well as administrative service on Departmental, college and University committees.

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2 Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary 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 reviews of research professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary research professors.

3 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair following a vote by the eligible faculty, which consists of all tenure-track faculty.

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

- For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all those with non-probationary research titles and tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

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

4 Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, 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.

5 Minimum Composition

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

B Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committees

There are two Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committees, a senior committee consisting of tenured Professors and a full committee that consists of all tenured Professors and Associate Professors. The Senior Committee considers promotion of Associate Professors to the rank of Professor whereas the other committee considers promotion of Assistant Professors to the rank of Associate Professor. The Chair is the same for both of the committees and is appointed by the Chair of the Department of Biological Chemistry and Pharmacology to a term of 4 years. These committees serve as a resource to faculty with questions on promotion and tenure issues; however, the Chair of the committee is responsible for directly assisting candidates for tenure and/or promotion in completion of the dossier. The full committee also conducts annual evaluations of untenured faculty assessing their yearly progress toward promotion and tenure and provides feedback and guidance for further faculty development. All committee members critically review the dossier of all promotion and tenure candidates in which the Department of Biological Chemistry and Pharmacology serves as the tenure initiating unit. Committee members vote on these issues. The committee Chair summarizes dossiers that are presented in consideration of reviews for promotion and/or tenure, but does not make a decision for, or a recommendation to, the AP& T committees. The full committee also reviews all faculty applicants on an annual basis for appointment or reappointment for adjunct or joint appointments within the Department.

C Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may

be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

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

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

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

1 Appointment

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

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

IV Appointments

A Criteria

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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment, as stipulated in the college guideline [Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document](#), Section V. B.

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2 Research Faculty

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

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

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

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

3 Associated Faculty

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

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

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

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to

provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

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

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

4 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

5 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a [memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the

appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B Procedures

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

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse 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 college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The dean 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 AA/EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

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

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified, diverse talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to AA/EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency, fairness, and equity in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the department chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

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

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

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

2 Research Faculty

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

3 Transfer from the Tenure Track

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

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

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

4 TIU Transfer

Following consultation with the department chair and college dean(s), a tenure-track faculty member may voluntarily move from one TIU to another upon approval of a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

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

5 Associated Faculty

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and

candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair following a vote by the eligible faculty (see Section III.A.3). The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair following a vote of the eligible faculty.

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

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

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

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

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

6 Joint Appointments

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.5. 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 TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An [MOU](#) signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

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

for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, the 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 chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the 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 department chair for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.
- Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.
- Annual performance and merit reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment.
- Per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#), department chairs are required to include a reminder in annual review letters that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair by a date that is announced by the department during the Spring semester:

- The department Faculty Annual Review Form
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

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

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

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

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

On an annual basis the probationary faculty member will provide to the Chair and the Department APT committee a written report describing activities during the preceding year as well as plans for the next year. It is expected that this report will include student teaching evaluations, a summary of funded and pending grants as well as a list of published and submitted papers. The report should also include a list of all service activities i.e., department, college, and university committees as well as a summary of all other professional activities. In addition to documentation of the candidate's achievements, the report may also contain any information documenting why it was not possible to achieve objectives and whether commitments made by the Department, College or University were not fulfilled as promised. The Chair of the APT Committee, in consultation with all tenured faculty, will provide the Department Chair with an overall written assessment of the progress of the candidate. The Department Chair shall then provide the faculty member with an overall letter of evaluation noting strengths and weaknesses. A copy of this letter is retained in the candidate's file and sent to the Dean of The College of Medicine.

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

2 Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

C Tenured Faculty

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

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; 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 academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

D Research Faculty

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

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue,

the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/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.

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

F Salary Recommendations

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

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

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

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1: TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, candidates must:	All candidates must submit a dossier for promotion/tenure consideration
Have provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in each instructional situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, case studies, problem sets, computer software demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content • Summary of class comments demonstrate instructional content up-to-date • Attended continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class • Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Awarding of “Endorsement” from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning • Received University or College awards for teaching excellence
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	
Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	
Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	
Treated students with respect and courtesy	
Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs	
Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the Department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise	
Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	
Demonstrate success in training graduate and postdoctoral scholars	

Table 2: SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstrated national recognition and impact for a coherent and thematic independent program of scholarship:	All candidates must submit a dossier for promotion/tenure consideration.
Achieve national recognition and impact on their field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications as first or senior author in their field’s highest quality or top-cited journals • Citation rates for the published papers • H-Index or other citation metric • Invitations to speak at national/international meetings • Invitations to present seminars at other institutions • Appointment to editorial boards or to review for high quality journals • Invitations to write review articles • Participation on steering, guideline, or advisory committees of national organizations • Invitations to serve on grant review panels • Receipt of national scientific awards • Invitations for productive collaborations with external researchers • Recognition of impact from outside evaluators
Establish a consistent pattern of high-quality publications resulting from work primarily conducted independently in the candidate’s laboratory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete publication record including archival journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents, and invention disclosures. • Publications as corresponding author in the principal, peer-reviewed journals of a field • 3 to 5 publications since appointment as assistant professor that are based primarily on research from the candidate’s laboratory in well-respected journals in the field • High impact publications in which faculty members have participated as a member of a broader team-based approach to manuscript development and publication
Demonstrate Ability to Obtain and Sustain Competitive Grant Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding as Principal Investigator (or Multi-Principal Investigator) on an R01, R35 or DP2 grant from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or an equivalent grant (e.g., National Science Foundation (NSF), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), or Department of Defense (DOD). • Demonstrate the potential to sustain external funding by renewing an NIH or equivalent grant, obtain funding from a peer-reviewed national foundation (e.g. American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, etc.), become a co-investigator on funded NIH grants, conversion of a transition grant to a federal grant as a principal investigator, or obtain funding from pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies.
Engaged in entrepreneurial activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate invention disclosures, software development, materials transfers (e.g., novel plasmids, transgenic animals, cell lines, antibodies, and similar reagents), technology commercialization, patent and copyrights, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements.

Table 3: SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have provided meaningful service at the department, college, university, or national level:	All candidates must submit a dossier for promotion/tenure consideration.
Demonstrated excellence in service to the department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on departmental committees • Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to department • Annual evaluations document excellent service to department
Demonstrated high quality administration to the university at any level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on college- or university-level committees • Participation on graduate program committees • Participation in graduate program activities (recruiting events, symposia, etc.)
Demonstrated service to the scientific community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on editorial boards of high-quality journals • Review of manuscripts for high-quality journals • Service on grant review panels for NIH or other federal agencies • Service on grant review panels for national foundations • Grant reviews for other academic institutions • Organization of regional/national/international scientific conferences

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure [see charts in Section VI.A.1], with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. The department expects an individual ready for promotion to Professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession.

Every candidate for promotion to professor is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. It should be noted that candidates are held to the highest standards of excellence in the areas most central to the duties for which they are responsible. As a faculty member's career progresses, they may be assigned duties that put more emphasis on one area of the department's mission relative to the others. For example, a small percentage of faculty members become heavily focused on the educational mission. For these faculty, promotion to professor requires exceptional achievement in the teaching mission while maintaining significant effort in research and service. Specific criteria for the promotion of education-focused faculty to professor are described in the appropriate sections below and outlined in Table 4.

(a) Publications

Demonstration of sustained national and international recognition and impact for a coherent, thematic, and independent program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to Professor. It is expected that the faculty member will have a consistent record of high-quality publications well beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor. The publications should be in the top, peer-reviewed journals that have impact in the appropriate field(s) of study. This may be documented by data from citation analysis, as well as by reference to the comments of external evaluators. A further evaluation is the citation index of individual papers, as well as the overall citations for the body of work. Evidence that the candidate for promotion has been instrumental in the research and writing of the publications should be provided by an annotated bibliography that indicates individual contributions to each work. Substantive review articles and books will be given consideration in addition to research peer-reviewed articles. The candidate's citation rate will be documented and verified by the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD); the dossier will contain a citation table that indicates the number of citations for individual papers published at The Ohio State University, as well as an overall career citation index. Education-focused Associate Professors should maintain a consistent record of publication as either senior author or co-author.

(b) Research Funding

It is expected that candidates for promotion to Professor must have a record of significant and sustained NIH, or other federal agency, funding since their promotion to Associate Professor. The research program should be supported by multiple sources, including NIH or equivalent grants or funding from national foundations as PI, as co-investigator on NIH or other national grants, or from industry sources. Education-focused faculty must continue to seek funding for their research as either PI or co-PI.

(c) Research Independence, Collaboration and Mentoring

At the Professor level, a candidate must have produced a unique and independent body of research that has been developed by the candidate and will show that the research program has benefited colleagues and students at the University and in the research community at large. Collaborations can provide evidence of mutual scientific accomplishments. Successfully mentored students and postdocs can provide evidence that training is ongoing in the context of the research program and can also contribute to the teaching component of the dossier.

(d) Reputation as a Scholar

The candidate must be recognized as an important participant or leader in the research community. For promotion to Professor, the candidate must have played a national leadership role and attained international recognition for their research. Such evidence could include invitations to present research findings at other institutions, as well as at national and international scientific meetings, appointments to editorial boards or repeated invitations to review manuscripts or grants, appointments to national review bodies such as NIH study sections or scientific advisory boards, responsibilities as an organizer of scientific meetings, invitations to provide critical reviews of a research topic, and assignments as a consultant to government agencies and private companies. External evaluators' comments also contribute to this category.

(e) Teaching Excellence

A record of continuing teaching excellence as an Associate Professor is required to justify promotion to the rank of Professor. Ideally, the faculty member should make new, unique, and impactful contributions to the teaching mission as an Associate Professor. Evidence for exemplary teaching includes outstanding student and peer evaluations, course design, a Training Program Directorship, successful training grants (T32), and teaching awards.

For Associate Professors whose primary duties are educational, promotion to Full Professor requires additional criteria. They must demonstrate a sustained record of teaching well beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor. This will generally include serving as an instructor for 3 semesters per year. The faculty member should work to sustain or increase enrollment in their course offerings. The faculty member must also create new programs and courses. These can include both in-person or online offerings.

(e) Service Excellence

Promotion to the rank of Professor also requires service with distinction to the College of Medicine, The Ohio State University, or in a national context. The faculty member should make new, unique, and impactful service contributions since Associate Professor. Criteria might include participation in leadership positions in a national society, participation in and appointment to management positions in College of Medicine, University or national committees, task forces and advisory groups and other leadership roles leading to the betterment of the organization being served.

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

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

Table 4: Education-Focused Promotion Criteria (Professor)

Scholarship	
Criteria	Evidence
Candidates must have demonstrated continued effort in a sustained research program:	All candidates must submit a dossier for promotion/tenure consideration.
Achieve impact on their field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications as first, middle, or senior author in high quality journals • Citation rates for the published papers • H-Index or other citation metric

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment to editorial boards or to review for high quality journals • Invitations to write review articles • participation on steering, guideline, or advisory committees of national organizations • invitations to serve on grant review panels • receipt of national scientific awards • invitations for productive collaborations with external researchers • recognition of impact from outside evaluators
establish a consistent pattern of high-quality publications resulting from work primarily conducted independently in the candidate's laboratory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete publication record including archival journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents, and invention disclosures. • Publications as co- author in the principal, peer-reviewed journals of a field • High impact publications in which faculty members have participated as a member of a broader team-based approach to manuscript development and publication
Demonstrate Ability to contribute to Competitive Grant Applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit grant applications as a co-investigator to federal agencies or national foundations. • Funding as co-investigator on R01 grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or an equivalent grant (e.g., National Science Foundation (NSF), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), or Department of Defense (DOD).

Teaching

Criteria	Evidence
Candidates must have provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in each instructional situation:	All candidates must submit a dossier for promotion/tenure consideration.
demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, case studies, problem sets, computer software demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content • Summary of class comments demonstrate instructional content up-to-date • Attended continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class • Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Awarding of "Endorsement" from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning • Received University or College awards for teaching excellence
demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	
engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	
provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	
treated students with respect and courtesy	
improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs	
engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	
Create new course offerings or programs	
Teach 3 semesters per year for the preponderance of years.	

3 Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4 Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

B Procedures

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

1 Tenure-Track and Research Faculty

a Candidate Responsibilities

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

- **Dossier**

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

While the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him/her/them. Faculty members preparing their dossiers for promotion and/or tenure review should consult Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs' [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) to ensure that all required documentation is included.

Teaching Documentation.

Student evaluations of individual courses administered by someone other than a faculty member are required and shall be available for every classroom and online course taught. In the case of medical school curriculum teaching, the faculty evaluations supervised by the College of Medicine will be used; in the case of other coursework, it will be the standard University course evaluation forms. Faculty evaluation of teaching will consist of two parts: review of lecture notes, materials and handouts; and firsthand observation in the classroom. The Chair, in consultation with the relevant APT committee, will appoint faculty members to evaluate the classroom presentations of all untenured faculty and associate professors. It is the responsibility of the Chair to ascertain that evaluations are carried out on an annual basis. Faculty attending lectures are required to submit a written report in which they evaluate the content and style of presentation. The contents of this report are discussed with faculty during the annual review process. Faculty will be evaluated in regard to the organization, presentation, and level of material, as well as student performance.

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

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every formal class
- Medical student evaluations (e.g., Vitals)
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the Department's peer evaluation of teaching program.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other Colleges or Universities
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

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

Research/Scholarship Documentation.

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

Scholarship is broadly defined including all aspects of basic science, clinical research including clinical trials and research based on cases or case series, educational outcomes research, development of academic modules, and entrepreneurship. Documentation shall include reprints of research articles. A measure of their impact as indicated by number of citations reported in Citation Index shall be further documentation of scholarship. New and emerging methods of dissemination of scholarship including websites, social media, etc. may also be considered as forms of scholarship. The nature of scholarship should be pertinent to the faculty member's track and pattern of responsibilities as defined above in this document.

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

Service Documentation.

Service activities include administrative work for the department, college or university; service to the profession such as leadership roles and editorial and reviewing activities. The candidate should provide lists and dates of service activities, including, grant review panels, manuscript reviews, editorial board service, professional society service, university committees, college committees, department committees, and community outreach. Efforts shall be made to identify indicators of the quality as well as the quantity of service roles. Service on NIH study sections or the editorial boards of high impact journal is considered to be of high quality. Indicators of the quality of service beyond the department and external to the University would include election or appointment to leadership roles, other evidence that the candidate's services are sought after rather than volunteered, and awards.

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

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

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

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. 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 research faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

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

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

b Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees Responsibilities

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

- The full committee reviews this APT document annually and recommends 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 the senior committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committees base their 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 Rule [3335-7-36](#) makes the same provision for

nonprobationary research faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

- A decision by the committees to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, each Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure committee will provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs [annual procedural guidelines](#).
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her/their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - 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 or is a member of a Discovery Theme.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote

on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the 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.

d Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. 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.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the relevant Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary department chair. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair; and
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he/she/they will submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the relevant Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

3 External Evaluations

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

a Peer and Near Peer Institutions

- R1 research universities as designated by the Carnegie classification of the Institute of Higher Education
- Baylor College of Medicine
- Rockefeller University
- Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences
- University of California San Francisco

- University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School
- University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center
- Weill Cornell Medicine

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research 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 department's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic 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.

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 or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

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

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

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

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

Annually the department chair, working with the department Education Committee, organizes the peer review of teaching. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the Education Committee are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and associated faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- To review the teaching of tenured professors at least once every other year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.
- To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the department chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

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

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