

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

Approved by the Faculty: 7/29/2020

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 9/7/2022

## 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.....	6
3 Conflict of Interest.....	6
4 Minimum Composition.....	6
B Promotion and Tenure Committee .....	6
C Quorum .....	7
D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	7
1 Appointment .....	7
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal .....	7
IV Appointments .....	7
A Criteria .....	7
1 Tenure-track Faculty.....	7
2 Research Faculty.....	8
3 Associated Faculty.....	10
4 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	10
5 Emeritus Faculty .....	10
B Procedures.....	11
1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	11
2 Research Faculty .....	13
3 Transfer from the Tenure-track .....	13
4 Associated Faculty.....	13
5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	14
V Annual Performance and Merit Review .....	15
A Documentation .....	15
B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty .....	16
1 Fourth-Year Review.....	16
2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period .....	17
C Tenured Faculty .....	17
D Research Faculty.....	17
E Associated Faculty .....	18
F Salary Recommendations .....	18
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	19
A Criteria and Documentation .....	19
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure .....	20
2 Promotion to Professor.....	24
3 Promotion of Research Faculty .....	24
B Procedures .....	28
1 Candidate Responsibilities .....	28
2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities .....	29
3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities .....	30
4 Department Chair Responsibilities .....	30
5 External Evaluations.....	32
6 Dossier.....	33
VII Appeals.....	33

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews.....	34
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....	34
A Student Evaluation of Teaching .....	34
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....	34
Appendix A: Suggested Format for Annual Review Report .....	37
Appendix B: Points to Consider in the Peer Evaluation of Teaching for Dossiers .....	40

## **I Preamble**

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

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

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

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

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

## **II Department Mission**

The mission of the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology within the College of Medicine and The Ohio State University has three fundamental components: education, research and service.

First is to educate undergraduate, graduate, and professional students in the physiological and cell biological sciences and skills basic to practice of medicine, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy and other allied health professions. Graduate education, which is incorporated in this function, prepares students for careers in physiological and cell biological research, research management and teaching. The educational mission of the Department is to strive for excellence in the didactic teaching of basic and applied aspects of physiology and cell biology. The graduate education mission encompasses research training of Masters and Ph.D. students; i.e., providing experienced mentors, state-of-the-art laboratory facilities and curricula to prepare students for careers in contemporary physiology, cell biology, and other related fields. The Department provides education and training for medical and graduate students in interdisciplinary programs, including the Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program (BSGP), the Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology Graduate Program (MCDB), the Biophysics Graduate Program, the Ohio State Biochemistry Program (OSBP), and the Medical Scientist Training Program (MSTP).

The research mission of the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology is to foster a creative, interdisciplinary environment that to conduct basic and applied research that extends the frontiers of physiological and cell biological science at all levels of biological organization from molecules to the whole organism with relevance for the solution of health problems in humans and animals. Faculty will

be responsible for the funding of their research programs through grant support, patent royalties or other mechanisms, and will disseminate knowledge acquired from their research through timely publication and other scholarly endeavors. Our research goals are to:

1. Lead interdisciplinary programs that promote the development of top-tier researchers, whose findings fundamentally advance our knowledge of physiology and cell biology and broadly impact human health.
2. Use cutting-edge model systems and technologies to accelerate fundamental mechanistic discoveries, diagnostic tools, and therapeutic strategies that can ultimately be translated into improved personalized patient care.
3. Maintain a diverse, collaborative training environment with strong mentorship that fosters intellectual creativity and instills the next generation of scientists with a passion to perform cutting-edge research.
4. To train graduate, post-graduate, professional, and undergraduate students in the conduct and methodology of research in physiology and cell biology; and to provide service for the general benefit of the life sciences community within the College of Medicine (COM) and The Ohio State University, as well as at the local, state and national levels.
5. Be international leaders in physiology and cell biology research.

The service mission of the Department is to provide service and expertise, to disseminate knowledge and provide administrative contributions to the biomedical community to The Ohio State University, the State of Ohio and national/international biomedical organizations.

### **III Definitions**

#### **A Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

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

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

#### **1 Tenure-track Faculty**

##### **Initial Appointment Reviews**

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the Department.
- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote 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 and the tenure reviews of probationary professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

## **2 Research Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment Reviews**

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the Department.
- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

### **Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews**

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

## **3 Conflict of Interest**

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

## **4 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 dean, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

## **B Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the eligible faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of at least five individuals (tenured professors or tenured associate professors) elected by the eligible departmental faculty. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible. The committee's chair is appointed for up to 2 years by the Department Chair with reappointment possible. Appointments in this committee are made in the early spring semester.

## **C Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is a simple majority (greater than 50%) of the committee. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave.

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

## **D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

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

### **1 Appointment**

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

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

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

## **IV Appointments**

### **A Criteria**

The Department of Physiology and Cell Biology 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, research and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the Department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

### **1 Tenure-track Faculty**

**Instructor.** Appointments at the rank of instructor are appropriate for individuals who could need time to establish a research program and set themselves up for the requirements to progress toward tenure. Appointments to this rank may also be made if all of the criteria for the position of assistant professor have been met with the exception that the candidate will not have completed a terminal degree, or other relevant training, at the time of the appointment. When an individual is appointed to the rank of instructor, the letter of offer

should indicate the specific benchmarks and achievements required for promotion to assistant professor. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor has not met the expectations for moving from instructor to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a 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 TIU's eligible faculty, the TIU Chair, the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs and if approved is irrevocable.

**Assistant Professor.** The minimum requirement for appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a field of study broadly identified with physiology and/or cell biology plus postdoctoral experience. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring no later than the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7<sup>th</sup> year will be the final year of employment. A probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the provision of University Rule [3335-6-08](#) and the provision of paragraphs (6), (H), and (I) of University Rule [3335-6-03](#).

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee (or 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.

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

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank 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.

The university will not grant tenure unless the candidate is a (1) U.S. citizen or national; (2) permanent resident ("green card" holder); (3) asylee or refugee; or (4) an individual otherwise described as a "protected individual" pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b). 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. The Department of Physiology and Cell Biology may determine the process for reappointment according to the procedures set forth in the [Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment Policy, III, A-G](#).

Research faculty appointments exist for individuals who focus entirely on research. These appointments are intended for individuals who will have faculty level responsibilities in the research mission, comparable to the level of a Co-Investigator. Appointments to the Research faculty are made in accordance with Chapter 7 of the *Rules of the University Faculty* [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the Department.

Contracts must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, research faculty appointments will require 100% salary recovery. It is expected that salary recovery will be entirely derived from extramural funds. The initial contract is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

Research faculty members are eligible to serve on University committees and task forces but not on University governance committees. Research faculty members also are eligible to advise and supervise graduate and postdoctoral students and to be a principal investigator on extramural research grant applications. Approval to advise and supervise graduate students must be obtained from the graduate school as detailed in Section 13 of the [Graduate School Handbook](#). Research faculty members comprise no more than thirty-three per cent of the number of tenure-track faculty in the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology and never constitute a majority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in the department.

**Research Assistant Professor.** The minimum requirement for appointment to the rank of Research Assistant Professor is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a field of study broadly identified with physiology and/or cell biology plus postdoctoral experience. Research Assistant Professor appointees shall document substantial contributions to their field of study as reflected by publications in peer-reviewed journals and the demonstrated potential to obtain extramural funding for their individual research.

**Research Associate Professor.** Research Associate Professor Appointment requires the candidate to have met the criteria listed above for Research Assistant Professor and established an independent program of research over a period of at least six years. It is expected that he/she will have published a significant body of independent work. Criteria for evaluation of the candidate's research program includes 1) publications in the principal peer-reviewed journals in the field of physiology and cell biology, 2) demonstrated ability to obtain and sustain extramural grant support, and 3) other evidence of a nationally/internationally recognized research program (e.g., invitations to speak at national or international scientific meetings, etc., as listed for Tenure Track Faculty in Section VI.A.1).

**Research Professor.** Criteria for appointment include demonstration of an independent, internationally recognized research program over a period of at least six years since

appointment as Research Associate Professor. Evaluation of the research program includes each of the criteria for the Research Associate Professor level, with the additional expectation that the research program has achieved a level of international prominence. Prominence will be judged, for example, by invited presentations at prestigious national and international meetings, invited reviews in high impact journals, and similar indicators listed above.

### **3 Associated Faculty**

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

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

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

### **4 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/track, with promotion in rank recognized.

### **5 Emeritus Faculty**

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department head outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department head. The department head will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to

Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

## **B Procedures**

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for information on the following topics:

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The appointment of Tenure Track positions must be based on a clear and sound plan for the programmatic future of the Department and College and on a realistic determination of the availability of resources to support the appointment. The Dean of the College must give prior approval for faculty searches. This approval will be based at least in part on a determination that the above criteria have been met. The departmental Chair shall discuss with the faculty the departmental goals, philosophy and strategic missions for appointments to the faculty. The departmental Search Committee and search committee chairperson shall be appointed by the departmental Chair after announcement of intent and discussion of goals, mission strategies and philosophy in a meeting of the faculty. This is a provisional committee that is constituted anew as vacancies occur within the department. The Search Committee will typically consist of six members, one of whom will be designated as the Diversity Advocate. The responsibility of the Search Committee is to identify the best qualified candidates to fill vacancies on the faculty consistent with the goals, mission and philosophy of the department.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college with resources from the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#).

General aspects of the charge to this committee consist of:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to the Department Chair approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. The university may only award tenure to faculty members who are: (1) U.S. citizens or nationals; (2) permanent residents (“green card” holders); (3) asylees or refugees; or (4) individuals otherwise described as “protected individuals” pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b).
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus or virtual interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

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

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

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

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

The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International

Affairs. The university will not grant tenure unless an individual is a (1) U.S. citizen or national; (2) permanent resident (“green card” holder); (3) asylee or refugee; or (4) an individual otherwise described as a “protected individual” pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b). The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in seeking residency status for the appointee promptly and diligently.

## **2 Research Faculty**

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

## **3 Transfer from the Tenure Track**

The Department of Physiology and Cell Biology shall provide for the possibility of transfer from the tenure-track faculty to a research faculty position if appropriate to departmental and faculty circumstances.

A request for transfer must be initiated by the tenure-faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed and the rank at which the faculty member expects to be appointed in the research. Appointment at the same rank as held in the tenure-track will be assumed unless circumstances dictate otherwise.

The departmental Appointments, Promotions and Tenure Committee will review requests for transfer and the expected rank and submit a recommendation for or against the transfer and the requested rank to the department chair. The department Chair, the College of Medicine Dean, and The Ohio State University Executive Vice President and Provost must approve all transfers.

Tenure or tenure eligibility is relinquished when a tenured or tenure-eligible faculty member transfers to research faculty.

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

## **4 Associated Faculty**

Associated Faculty appointments are initiated either by the candidate, or by a representative of the Department responsible for a program (usually an educational program) in which the candidate is expected to have a substantial role. Letters of request should include: (1) Reasons for the request. (2) A statement of potential benefits of the appointment for both the faculty member and the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology (3) Documentation of previous contributions to and associations with the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology and (4) Any additional information of relevance. Requests for associated appointment must include a current curriculum vitae and a letter of concurrence from the candidate's supervisor.

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure committee. The basis for review shall include: (1) the training and background of the applicant relative to the disciplines of Physiology and Cell Biology, (2) the compatibility of the applicant's research interests with the overall departmental mission, and (3) the capacity and willingness of the applicant to contribute

to the teaching, research and/or service missions of the Department. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall advise the departmental Chair by letter of a positive or negative recommendation for granting an associated or courtesy appointment. The recommendation shall be presented to the faculty by the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair at a faculty meeting.

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 Promotion and Tenure committee.

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

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Renewal of associated appointments shall be subject to review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the departmental Chair at the appropriate time. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall notify associated appointees by letter of the approaching renewal date and inquire about interest in renewal of the appointment. Consideration for renewal shall require: (1) a letter from the appointee stating interest in reappointment and the perceived benefits of reappointment, (2) a letter of support from the Chair of the appointee's primary department, and (3) a current curriculum vitae. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall advise the departmental Chair by letter of a positive or negative recommendation for renewal of the appointment. The recommendation shall be placed on the agenda of a faculty meeting and be presented to the faculty by the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. If not renewed, the appointment shall terminate automatically at the end of the appointment period.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews below), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

## **5 Courtesy Appointments**

Courtesy appointees (those having joint appointments with no salary) are faculty members from other departments who make important contributions to the Department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching, or a combination of these.

Courtesy appointments are initiated either by the candidate, or by a representative of the Department responsible for a program (usually an educational program) in which the candidate is expected to have a substantial role. Letters of request should include: (1) Reasons for the request. (2) A statement of potential benefits of the appointment for both the faculty member and the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology (3) Documentation of previous contributions to and associations with the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology and (4) Any additional information of relevance.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall advise the departmental Chair by letter of a positive or negative recommendation for granting a courtesy appointment. The recommendation shall be

presented to the faculty by the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair at a faculty meeting. Courtesy appointments will be reviewed annually by the Chair and will be renewed every three years by vote in the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Titles assigned to courtesy appointments must mirror those held in the individuals' University appointments.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall notify courtesy appointees by letter of the approaching renewal date and inquire about interest in renewal of the appointment. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall advise the departmental Chair by letter of a positive or negative recommendation for renewal of the appointment. The recommendation shall be placed on the agenda of a faculty meeting and be presented to the faculty by the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. If not renewed, the appointment shall terminate automatically at the end of the appointment period.

## **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](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

The annual performance and merit review of every faculty member is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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

### **A Documentation**

On an annual basis, faculty members will provide to the Chair, an updated CV and complete the annual activity report (see Appendix A for example), a form 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 all national level service such as grant review committees, manuscript review, editorial boards, etc), as well as a summary of all other professional activities. It is required that probationary faculty use the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3. This is also recommended for associate professors.

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

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

## **B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty**

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

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

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

### **1 Fourth-Year Review**

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the Dean 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 Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee will separately review the candidate's dossier and the annual review letters from the three preceding years. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty members vote 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 prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The Department Chair will then meet with the candidate and share the review from the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the recommendation. 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.



Appointment to the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the College of Medicine. Before reaching a negative decision, or a decision contrary to that expressed in the letter from the Department Chair, the Dean will consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

## **2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period**

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

## **C Tenured Faculty**

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

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

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

## **D Research Faculty**

In the first term, research appointments in the Department are probationary, with annual reviews to be conducted by the Department Chair. 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.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract.

Full reviews by the Promotion and Tenure Committee will take place in the penultimate year of the appointment, with a specific recommendation based on a majority vote being made to the Chair regarding whether the appointment should be extended and a new contract offered. Non-probationary Research Faculty may participate in the review of Research Faculty of lower rank.

The Chair will conduct an independent review. The Chair will inform the Research Faculty member whether the appointment will be renewed for another term. Subsequent appointment will be for one to five years. In all cases, there is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of the contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, Research Faculty appointments may be terminated for not meeting the terms of the contract (e.g., failure to obtain extramural support). Appointments may also be terminated during a contract period for cause (see [Faculty Rule 3335-5-04](#)) or financial exigency (see [Faculty Rule 3335-5-02.1](#)). Termination decisions for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by Faculty Rules. The standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#) apply to Research Faculty appointments. In addition, a contract may be renegotiated during a contract period, but only with the voluntary consent of the Research Faculty member.

### **E Associated Faculty**

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's recommendation 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 quality of teaching, scholarship and service, as established during the annual review, will all be taken into account in assessing performance for purposes of merit salary increases each year. Because the assignments and duties of individual faculty members differ, the relative weight given to accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service will vary.

#### **Criteria:**

Consistent with the mission of the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology, recommendations for merit salary increases shall be based upon an evaluation of performance in the following areas: teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

#### **A. Teaching**

Evaluation of teaching performance shall be based upon both the quantity and the quality of teaching. Quantity shall be determined in part by the number of formal lectures given by the faculty member (including lectures given in the PCB courses, Pharmacy course provided by PCB faculty and medical school). Extra credit shall be assigned to course directors to reflect the additional responsibilities required for administration. Consideration also will be given for: 1) serving as major/permanent research advisor to graduate students, 2) participation in special graduate activities such as

laboratories and student rotations, 3) participation as a member of qualifying, general and final examination committees, 4) advising professional and/or undergraduate student research and 5) formal advising of junior or mid-career faculty. The quality of teaching shall be assessed by means of student evaluation of instruction and documented peer review letters. Note that quantity alone will not be sufficient to receive the highest teaching merit score.

## **B. Research/Scholarship**

Evaluation of productivity in research shall be based upon the quality and quantity of publications, patents, or other evidence of scholarship subject to peer-review, and the amount and sources of research funding and salary recovery on grants or licenses. The highest priority for peer-reviewed publications shall be given to first, senior (i.e., publications of the faculty member's students or postdoctoral fellows) or corresponding authored publications in peer-reviewed journals. Other authorships will also be considered for collaborative seminal papers where the faculty made significant contributions. Only manuscripts first published during the academic year under review will be considered. As such, publications listed as in press shall not be considered as part of the evaluation, and publications previously released in electronic versions cannot be counted when a new format is available. Measures of impact will be used to evaluate quality of publications when available. The highest priority for research funding shall be given for principal investigators on grants from nationally and internationally competitive, peer-reviewed, sources.

## **C. Service**

Service encompasses work that provides professional expertise to the Department, College, University and/or national or international biomedical organizations. Additional community service and fundraising related to appropriate professional outreach for the Department, College, University or biomedical research organizations will also be considered.

### **Procedure:**

As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. 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.

Consideration also will be given to the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall record and to the salaries of other individuals within the Department with comparable overall records. Salary equity pay raises will be considered in raise recommendations, but they are separate from merit salary increases.

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**

### **A Criteria and Documentation**

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.*

### **1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

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

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

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

The awarding of tenure is an acknowledgment of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It requires evidence of consistent achievement throughout the professional life of the faculty member. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

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

The Department of Physiology and Cell Biology will apply high standards for the award of tenure, since a positive tenure decision has a powerful impact on the quality and future of the Department. Although criteria will vary slightly according to the particular responsibilities of each faculty member, every candidate will be held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Faculty members are evaluated on the totality of their performance in all areas of responsibility (research, teaching and service) with emphasis on their primary area(s) of responsibility. In general, Tenure Track Faculty are expected to spend the majority of their effort on research (their primary area), and tenure decisions will be weighted accordingly. Mediocre performance in the primary area (e.g., research) cannot be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in other areas. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally. While all accomplishments to date will be taken into consideration, particular

attention will be paid to the accomplishments in scholarship since a faculty member's appointment at The Ohio State University.

#### A. Research/Scholarship

Demonstration of national recognition and impact for a coherent and thematic independent program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to Associate Professor and the award of tenure. Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in the field of physiology and cell biology. As laid out in the [College of Medicine APT Document](#), there are multiple metrics available for judging the excellence and impact of scholarship, and the full range of available criteria should be considered in evaluating the candidate's program. Quality and innovation will be considered more important than sheer quantity or strict adherence to traditional scope. Evidence of quality includes the impact factor of the journal in which the publication appears and its level of impact in the Assistant Professor's specialized field. Funding from NIH or an equivalent Federal Agency (e.g., NSF, DoD, USDA, etc.) as a Principal Investigator, including the Multiple Principal Investigator mechanism, is mandatory for promotion. Additional established indicators of a national reputation are requirements for promotion and tenure. Specific criteria for evaluation of the candidate's research program include:

##### (1) Achievement of National Recognition and Impact on the Field

First and foremost, promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure requires excellence and demonstration of significant impact in research. Impact is the single most important criterion for promotion and is determined primarily by high quality research. There are several measures that will be considered by the Promotion and Tenure Committee as evidence of scientific impact: (a) Publications as senior author in the field's high impact factor or top-cited journals, (b) citation rates (the number of times a paper has been cited by other publications), (c) the candidate's h-index or other citation metrics, (d) invitations to speak at national and international meetings and for seminars at other institutions, (e) appointment to editorial boards or to review for top-level journals, (f) invitations to write review articles, (g) participation on steering, guideline, or advisory committees of national organizations, (h) invitations to serve on grant review panels, (i) receipt of national scientific awards, (j) invitations for productive collaborations with external researchers, and (k) recognition of impact from outside evaluators.

Successful promotion will require the demonstration of impact, not just the potential for impact. Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%), and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles; book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion. The 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. It is recognized that the citation rate for papers published within 1-2 years before review for promotion and tenure may be low due to the short time the work has been available. However, evidence that the work is well received would be supportive of its impact, and would commonly be documented in outside expert letters of evaluation (see below). Considered together, demonstration of impact and a national reputation of an independent program of research is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure.

##### (2) Publications

Publications represent the archival results of the faculty member's research program both before and since their appointment in the Department, and play a critical role in evaluations for promotion and tenure. On average, the journals should carry impact factors of 3-6 in the ISI Web of Knowledge ® Journal Citation Reports ® index, or equivalent measure using a recognized citation report mechanism. Impact of the Assistant Professor's publications in his/her field of expertise can also be related to the number of times a publication or total publications is/are cited by other authors. In addition, evidence of citation impact may include authorship of exceptional quality contributions that are too recent to have reached a critical citation count as indicated in external evaluation letters or an outstanding Hirsch- Index (H-Index) value for rank. The departmental P&T Committee will use a reasonable balance of journal impact factor, citations by other authors (e.g., Citation Index), overall quality of the publishing medium and comments from extramural authorities in the Assistant Professor's specialized field as criteria in evaluation of the quality of his/her publication record. If a former mentor is retained as an author on the candidate's papers beyond the first two years of faculty appointment, the reasons must be clearly stated with regard to independence of the candidate's research program. It is expected that faculty members will publish consistently. The primary metric for evaluating publication records will be to determine whether the faculty member has established a consistent pattern of high-quality publications resulting from work primarily conducted independently in the candidate's laboratory. Publications as corresponding author in the principal, peer-reviewed journals of a field would be considered suitable for meeting the criteria. It is expected that independent, publications as corresponding author will constitute a substantial portion of the publication list. However, faculty members are encouraged to participate in collaborative multidisciplinary research, and it is therefore recognized that a faculty member's record of scholarship will include papers on which they are secondary author. High impact publications in which faculty members have participated as a member of a broader team-based approach to manuscript development and publication will also be recognized as evidence of scholarship, especially when specific roles in team scholarship are communicated in the dossier, and demonstrate unique intellectual and/or leadership contributions.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the successful candidates should publish, on average, at least one to two peer-reviewed publication as senior or co-corresponding author, and at least two collaborative publications per year, although it is acceptable to be below this level of productivity in the early years of the appointment. The total number will thus depend on the years in rank but in general, candidates will have published 15-20 peer-reviewed research papers. Of these, 5-10 publications should be as senior or co-senior author primary research publications since their appointment as Assistant Professor. Appearing as the first or last name in the list of authors for a publication or equivalent designation in the published document denotes senior author status. However, productivity that exceeds these guidelines does not guarantee a positive promotion and tenure recommendation if the research is not judged to be of acceptable quality or impact; thus, it is not advisable to publish the smallest quanta of data to enhance publication numbers. **Importantly, these numbers are intended as general guidelines and thus productivity below these ranges can result in a positive promotion and tenure review if strong impact can be established for the candidate's independent research (e.g., papers in the highest impact journals may substitute for several in lower-impact journals). The impact of these publications, rather than sheer numbers, will be the major criterion for promotion.** Emphasis will be on the quality of the work as recognized by their peers and as addressed by the external evaluators.

(3) Demonstrated Ability to Obtain and Sustain Competitive Grant Support  
Funding as Principal Investigator (or Multi-Principal Investigator) on an R01 from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or an equivalent grant (e.g., NSF, DOD, DOE, etc.) is a mandatory

requirement for promotion. Additionally, a candidate should demonstrate the capability to sustain funding; for example, by competitive renewal of an NIH or equivalent grant or receipt of: (i) peer-reviewed funding from other national agencies or foundations (e.g. American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, etc.), (ii) awards as co-Investigator on NIH or equivalent grant, or (iii) funding from industry. In addition to R01 grants, any of the latter provide a strong indicator of national reputation, but are not by themselves sufficient demonstration of the ability to obtain and sustain national support.

#### (4) Research Independence and Collaboration

It is recognized that research collaboration is important for attaining new knowledge, and is encouraged. Fruitful collaborations usually involve important and recognizable contributions from each of the collaborators. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is a valued component of the dossier that demonstrates a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship, and includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding. Individual input of the faculty member as a middle author may also be uniquely contributory and should be clearly evident. Evidence that the candidate for promotion has been instrumental in the research and writing of publications should be provided by an annotated bibliography that indicates individual contributions to each work.

#### (5) Entrepreneurship as a Special Form of Scholarship

Entrepreneurship is a special form of scholarship valued by the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology. Entrepreneurship includes, but may not be limited to, 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. In as much as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, such contributions will be analyzed flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenues considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion and tenure dossier.

### B. Teaching

To receive a positive recommendation for promotion, an Assistant Professor's contribution to teaching must be evaluated as satisfactory according to the following criteria:

1. A significant contribution to the Departmental Teaching mission as agreed upon in consultation with the Department Chair.
2. Sufficient evidence of satisfactory performance as a lecturer or other mode of instructional presentation derived from formal quantitative student evaluations of the Assistant Professor's performance in the classroom, laboratory and/or Internet based instruction. The candidate should have received advice from the individual's Junior Faculty Advisory Committee on strategies for obtaining "sufficient" evidence of satisfactory performance in teaching during the probationary period.
3. Evaluation of teaching and progress in the quality of teaching in the form of letters from a minimum of three faculty peers who have witnessed a) two or more successive teaching presentations; and/or b) invited didactic lectures at another nationally recognized institution.

4. Receipt of a competitive college or university award for teaching is helpful, but not required for evaluation of teaching as "satisfactory".
5. Involvement in graduate education as evidenced by, but not limited to the following: (1) service as major/permanent advisor to graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows, (2) participation in special graduate activities such as laboratories and student rotations, (3) service on qualifying, general and final examination committees, (4) advising the research of students enrolled in the professional schools or colleges of The Ohio State University, and (5) participation in graduate forums, seminars, reviews, etc.
6. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards F31, F32 or other mentored fellowship awards for graduate students or postdoctoral fellows is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. Documented success in degree completion by trainees, as well as impactful student mentorship, evidenced by completion of candidacy exams, publications, fellowships, invited talk, and awards to trainees who are sponsored by the faculty member, also can contribute to the teaching component of the dossier.
7. Improved curriculum through revision or development of new courses and/or academic programs. Improvement of the curriculum should be measured through a sustained increase in student enrolment along with favorable reviews.

### C. Service

A candidate for promotion and tenure shall also be held to a high standard of service, which includes service to the College, University, scientific community, as well as to the Department. Community service that utilizes the professional expertise of the faculty member is also relevant. Exemplars of national service include service on editorial review boards of journals, service on study sections from national granting agencies, election to offices for professional societies, and organization of national meetings or symposia.

An Assistant Professor's service must include the following:

1. Membership and service on a minimum of one faculty committee, preferably within the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology, for at least three years.
2. Participation in at least one College or University committee.
3. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline including committee membership or leadership in professional societies, multiple ad hoc journal reviews or proposal reviews for national professional societies and/or NIH.

## **2 Promotion to Professor**

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

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



The promotion to Professor is not automatic, nor dependent on the number of years of service. Promotion in rank from Associate Professor to Professor will be considered in any year with no regard to any minimum period of time while in rank as Associate Professor. The following guidelines are general in nature and are intended to serve as a minimum range of criteria in the categories of research, teaching and service that the candidate should achieve before application for promotion to Professor. The academic achievements of the candidate for his/her entire career will be considered, with focus on the professional development of the candidate since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national leadership and/or international reputation in the field.

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

Metric evidence that the candidate has a sustained, eminent record of achievement recognized nationally and internationally can be demonstrated by accomplishment of key scholarly achievements as exemplified in the following:

A. Research/Scholarship:

1. 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-cited, 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. On average, the journals should carry impact factors of at least 3-6 in the ISI Web of Knowledge ® Journal Citation Reports ® index, or equivalent measure using a recognized citation report mechanism. 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. The number of publications that satisfies these criteria will depend upon their quality and impact on the field. As a general guideline, within the disciplines of the Department, an average of 2-3 publications as senior author per year and 2-3 collaborative publications per year would be expected. Appearing as the first or last name in the list of authors for a publication or equivalent designation in the published document denotes senior author status. Therefore, candidates for promotion to professor should ideally have a minimum of 20 to 25 peer-reviewed publications since their promotion to Associate Professor. **Importantly, while these numbers are intended as general guidelines, fewer papers in the highest impact journals may substitute for more**

**in lower-impact journals. The impact of these publications, rather than sheer numbers, will be the major criterion for promotion. Emphasis will be on the quality of the work as recognized by their peers and as addressed by the external evaluators.** 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.

Invention disclosures, income-producing, patent awards and licensing will be recognizable as scholarly activities and equivalencies to traditional publications.

## 2. Research Funding

It is expected that candidates for promotion to Professor must have established and maintained a sustained record of continued significant funding as a Principal Investigator (or MPI) on multiple competitively reviewed grants from US Government agencies (e.g. NIH, NSF, DoD) while in rank as Associate Professor. This includes designation as a PI on an ongoing funded R01 or equivalent plus a second significant grant as a PI, MPI, or PD on a P01 or equivalent type of grants.

Funding from other national agencies or foundations as PI, as co-investigator on NIH or other national grants, or from industry, are positive factors that will receive consideration in the overall evaluation of quality and quantity of research productivity.

## 3. 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 and collaborative science is also included in the candidate dossier and contributes to the establishment of recognized scholarship. 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. Documented mentoring of not only students and post-doctoral fellows but of junior faculty should be an expectation for promotion to Professor.

## 4. 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/or 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.

## B. Teaching Excellence

- All members of the faculty shall participate in the Department's teaching effort and shall carry out their duties in a highly professional and competent manner. Neither the quantity nor quality of teaching, by themselves, shall normally be considered as sufficient grounds for promotion to Professor; a lack of teaching and/or poor quality teaching may, however, be

grounds for denial or delay in promotion to Professor. The nature of what constitutes a fair share of the instructional effort is best left to the department Chair, in consultation with appropriate Departmental committees. Evaluation of the volume of the candidate's teaching commitment will be balanced by the amount of documented release time (i.e., percent effort) committed to extramural-funded research since appointment at the rank of Associate Professor.

The College of Medicine requires that the dossiers of candidates for promotion to professor contain at least one peer teaching evaluation per year.

- Demonstration of level of quality in the performance of teaching requires documentation by at least three of the following:
  1. Quantitative evidence of quality derived from student evaluations and subjective comments obtained from students and postdoctoral trainees. All forms of teaching evaluation must be validated by the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.
  2. Receipt of a competitive college or university award for teaching.
  3. Awards secured as a mentor for training grants such as NIH T31, T32 or K-awards F31, F32 or other nationally recognized mentored fellowship awards for graduate students or postdoctoral fellows.
  4. Mentorship of junior faculty by serving on a junior faculty advisory committee, as evidenced by providing a mentees' evaluation.
- Demonstration of a body of mentorship by guiding students to successful completion of the Doctoral of Philosophy Degree and/or guiding post-docs to a successful academic career during the faculty member's academic career at The Ohio State University.
- Advised, assisted and/or examined additional graduate, medical and/or undergraduate students.

### C. Service Excellence

Promotion to the rank of Professor also requires service with distinction to the College of Medicine, The Ohio State University, or in National/International biomedical organizations. 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. National/international service may not substitute for contributions to the intramural community. Service requirements may be met by the following service expectations:

- Participation and Leadership of at least one Departmental Committee
- Participation on University and/or College Committees.
- Leadership role in a national and/or International professional society recognized by experts in the candidate's field of study.
- NIH study section or equivalent federal panel membership and/or multiple ad hoc participations in NIH study sections and/or national or international society committees.
- Journal editor- or editorial board membership and/or a sustained record of ad-hoc review for top tier journals in the field.

### 3. Promotion of Research Faculty

Promotion for research faculty depends on research scholarship and impact alone, with criteria identical to those outlined above for Tenure Track Faculty. Scientific independence, high quality publications, extramural grant support and national/international reputation are primary. The distribution of effort for research faculty is 100% research and scholarly pursuit.

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

(b) Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

## B Procedures

The Department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology.

### 1 Candidate Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates are fully responsible for the contents of the dossier and 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.
- To submit a copy of the APT document under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may submit their Department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, 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. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the Department.
- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair decides whether

removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.) Under no circumstances should a candidate solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

- Once the process starts, only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure after external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Department Chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the Department, the Chair shall inform the Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. In no case will tenure be granted subsequent to such withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year.

## **2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities**

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

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - There is no limitation to the number of times that an untenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion and tenure review.
  - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
  - Faculty members who are not 1) U.S. citizens or nationals; (2) permanent residents ("green card" holders); (3) asylees or refugees; or (4) individuals otherwise described as "protected individuals" pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b) may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until the status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of status as a "protected individual" under the immigration laws are moreover not considered for promotion by this department. The committee will confirm the status of an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review with the department chair.
  - A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
  - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair.
  - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
  - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
  - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
  - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair.
  - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for 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.

### **3 Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities**

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

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

### **4 Department Chair Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) Faculty members who are not 1) U.S. citizens or nationals; (2) permanent residents (“green card” holders); (3) asylees or refugees; or (4) individuals otherwise described as “protected individuals” pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b) may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until the status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of status as a “protected individual” under the immigration laws are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a Department Chair of any Department in which the candidate has a joint appointment.
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. The TIU head will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the Department review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier.

The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the Department Chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the Department Chair is final in such cases.
- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the Department Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.
- Candidates will also be reviewed at the College and University levels. The Department Chair is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the Executive Vice President and Provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the Board of Trustees (if positive).

## **5 External Evaluations**

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research appointment contract renewals and promotion, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews.

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

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty



Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this Department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The Department follows the Office of Academic Affairs [suggested format](#) for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

## **6 Dossier**

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

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 or the last five years, whichever is less, to present.

The time period for scholarship 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 to present. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence over time. There should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time.

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 to present.

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.

## **VII Appeals**

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

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

## **VIII Seventh-Year Reviews**

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

Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, the department may petition the dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty and the department chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions of the seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the dean concurs with the department's petition, the dean shall in turn petition the executive vice president and provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in non-renewal of the appointment. The conduct of the seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of appointment is that stated in the letter of non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by the department, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review.

## **IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

### **A Student Evaluation of Teaching**

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

### **B Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

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

- A. The Junior Advisory Committee (selected by candidates) shall provide an

annual peer evaluation of teaching for each probationary faculty member. In a similar manner, the department chair shall appoint a peer review group to evaluate the teaching performance of tenured faculty members seeking promotion. This group shall consist of at least two tenured professors. This review will occur at least two years before a request for promotion is anticipated.

- B. The Peer Review of Teaching Committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation procedure and to review the course/teaching activities documentation. Documentation should include: syllabus and course materials. Each review committee member will observe the classroom teaching at least twice (this would typically result in four total observations of teaching). Review committee members do not need to observe on the same day and do not need to alert the candidate of their intended visit. The candidate should, however, advise the committee members as to times when observation would not be productive, such as days of exams, guest speakers, and so forth. Classroom observation should be evaluated using a standardized list of criteria as in the attached appendix (Appendix B, "Points to consider in the Peer Evaluation of Teaching"). After completion of the observation of the classroom teaching, the committee will prepare a written report. This report will be given to the instructor evaluated and a copy will also be included as part of the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The candidate has the option to include a written response to the review in his/her dossier.

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

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty at least once per year during the each year of service before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors in the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology at least once a 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 professors in the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology 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 [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

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

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

**APPENDIX A: SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT**

All faculty are expected to maintain a current record of activities. Probationary faculty are required to submit for their annual review, the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, as can be found in the Policies and Procedures Handbook, Volume 3. For annual review reports to the Chair, the following format is recommended.

**PCB ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT**  
**Review Period July 1, 202X – June 30, 202X**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_

**RESEARCH**

1. Research funding (funding agency, type (R01, R21), **start/ end dates, direct cost/year, % salary recovery for YOU**). For each grant, **list collaborators and their associated department, school and university:**

a. Current awards as PI or Dual PI. *Please fill in the table.*

Mechanism	PI	% Salary recovery for YOU	Start Date	End Date	Co-PI			Co-Is or Collaborators			Direct Cost
					Name	School Affiliation	Dept.	Name	School Affiliation	Dept.	

b. Current awards as Co-I or subcontracts. *Please fill in the table.*

Mechanism	PI (School)	Start Date	End Date	Co-PI			Co-Is or Collaborators			Direct Cost
				Name	School Affiliation	Dept.	Name	School Affiliation	Dept.	

c. Current mentored awards (pre-doctoral, post-doc, K08, HHMI mentor, etc.).

d. List grants submitted as PI but not yet scored (give submission date) and in preparation with anticipated submission date.

e. List grants submitted as co-I but not yet scored (give submission date) and in preparation with anticipated submission date.

f. List grants submitted as PI but not funded (give submission date and outcome score).

2. Publications (***Include full citation, including all other authors, and impact factor (use first date of public release only)***)

a. First or senior-authored peer-reviewed articles (*provide **impact factor** if available*)

b. Non-peer reviewed publications as first or senior author (*e.g. book chapters, editorials, reviews*)

c. Non-senior author publications

d. List of publications submitted (but not yet accepted) and in preparation with anticipated submission date.

3. Any additional research awards or honors

### TEACHING

1. Didactic Teaching. *Please fill in the table, adding rows as applicable.*

Course Name/#	# Lecture hours/lecture equivalents (moderate seminar class or small group discussion)	Are these new lectures? (Y/N)	SEI (please attach)	Course affiliation (ie. dept, college, university, etc.)

2. List course director role(s) (***indicate course and affiliation, such as Department, College, University course, and number of students***).

3. Number of exams proctored:

4. Mentoring (*please fill in the table, including names of individuals, full time/part time, #months*):

# Postdocs	
# Graduate Students	
# Rotating Graduate Students	
# Research Staff	
# Medical Students	
# Undergraduate Students	
# Junior Faculty Mentees	

5. Additional, notable teaching activities (e.g., substantive development of course curriculum, training grant PI, teaching awards).

**SERVICE**

1. List the number of invited lectures and provide location(s).
2. List the number of editorial boards sat on and provide journal(s).
3. List number of patents or IP(s). Provide title and co-investigators.
4. Describe any participation in development or fundraising activities.
5. List permanent member study section positions; note any chair positions.
6. List ad hoc study section positions.
7. Please fill out the following table, using the examples as a guide.

# Manuscript Reviews	
Qualifying Exam Committee Member (#)	
Dissertation Committee Member (#)	
Graduate Representative for Dissertation (#)	
# Poster Presentations at national or international meetings (your lab)	
# Poster Presentations at national or international meetings (included as co-author)	
Departmental Committee Member ( <i>Indicate role on committee</i> )	
College or University Committee Member ( <i>Indicate role on committee</i> )	

8. Additional acts of service to your profession, the University, College or Department (eg. Abstract/poster judging, and professional society committee member).

**Miscellaneous**

Other professional activities of importance that are not engendered by research, teaching and service categories not already listed.

**Goals for the next year (list your goals for all three missions: research, teaching, service):**

## APPENDIX B: POINTS TO CONSIDER IN THE PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR DOSSIERS

*Points to consider in the evaluation of teaching materials.* The following criteria are to be used as guidelines for evaluating teaching materials. It should be recognized that not all times will apply to all situations. The peer review committee and candidate should select those items that are appropriate for a particular situation. A five-point rating scale may be used to help the reviewer evaluate materials. An overall score is not a part of the review process.

### SYLLABUS

Completeness: Does it have each of the following?

- course information
- instructor information
- information on course readings
- goals and objectives of course
- policies on grading, academic misconduct, late work, absences
- calendar of class activities
- Description of assignments/due dates

Clarity of Communication: Is syllabus clear? Are rights, responsibilities and consequences spelled out?

Appropriateness of Tone: Does the syllabus further rapport and respect between instructor and students? Does it communicate a helpful positive motivational, non-threatening but challenging attitude?

Appropriateness of Content: Is the content covered in the course reflective of the course objectives? Is the content covered in a logical order?

Currency of Content: Does the course content portray the current state of the field? Does it use readings that reflect the latest scholarship?

Level of Challenge: Does the course require students to do an appropriate amount of reading and assignments at an appropriate level?

Pacing: Is the course calendar realistic? Has the instructor selected a reasonable amount of content for the time allotted? Are the dates for assignments distributed well?

Testing and Grading: Do the students receive frequent feedback? Are the grading policies fair and appropriate for the goals?

Student-Centeredness: Do the office hours or other information portray that the instructor is accessible for help? Are other resources available for the student? Do the activities show a concern for active student engagement?

### COURSE PACKET AND TEXTBOOK

#### ASSESSMENT

- Match with goals of course
- Contain accurate content
- Most current source
- Present multiple viewpoints
- Appropriate level of interest
- Appropriate reading level
- Visually attractive
- Appropriate amount of reading
- Clearly organized
- User friendly

### COURSE HANDOUTS

- Supplement course content
- Contain accurate content
- Appropriate reading level
- Adequate level of detail
- Demonstrate instructional skills
- Show creativity

### MULTIMEDIA COURSE

#### MATERIALS

- Match with goals/objectives of course
- Accuracy of content
- Currency of content
- Production quality
- Interest level
- Attractiveness
- Appropriate length
- Appropriate level of difficulty
- Clarity of organization
- User friendly
- Permit interactivity
- Permit self-pacing
- Provide branching options
- Provide user feedback
- Provide for students with special needs

#### TESTS

- Clarity of directions
- Test items match course objectives
- Legibility and Layout
- Appropriate length
- Clarity of test items
- Standards for grading clearly specified
- Appropriate level of challenge
- Inclusion of higher order thinking
- Organization of content

### CLASS ASSIGNMENTS/ EXERCISE SHEETS

- Supplement course content
- Match objectives of course
- Provide clear directions



Provide a meaningful learning experience  
Appropriate level of challenge  
Outline assessment method  
Clearly state purpose  
Demonstrate instructor creativity  
Promote student engagement (active learning)  
Adequate time/resources for completion

#### OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS ABOUT TEACHING MATERIALS

What aspects of the instructor's teaching materials clearly stood out as effective in facilitating student learning?  
What recommendations do you have that might aid in improving the instructor's teaching materials?

#### ***EXTENSION PLAN***

The audience is clearly identified  
Examples of appropriate teaching situations are provided

Overall objectives are identified  
Behavioral objectives are specified  
Plan is practical  
Limitations for use of materials are specified  
Plan is arranged in logical order  
Time line is practical  
Plan is flexible  
Complete list of resources needed - with educational materials is provided  
If part of a large program - relationship is explained

#### **EXTENSION EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS**

Difficulty level of material is appropriate for audience  
Topic is important  
Content matches stated objectives  
Content is accurate  
Content is up-to-date  
Presentation method fits audience  
Content is sufficiently in depth  
Appropriate balance between major points  
Appropriate form or design of material for subject matter  
Materials are appealing to eye/ear  
Written/audio materials are clear and concise  
Information is presented in logical order  
Quality of materials is professional  
"Non-original" materials are appropriate for stated objectives

***Points to consider in the observation of classroom teaching.*** The following checklist and comment questions are guidelines to be used when evaluating classroom performance. Not all items will apply or be observed in every observation experience. These items are to be used as illustrations of good teaching behavior. A five-point rating scale may be used to help the reviewer evaluate materials. An overall score is not a part of the review process.

#### INSTRUCTOR ORGANIZATION

Arrives for class on time  
States relation of class to previous one or larger program  
Knows how to use technology as needed  
States or posts objectives  
Provides outline for class lesson  
Makes transitional statements between segments  
Conveys purpose of each class activity  
Summarizes periodically  
Completes topics scheduled for the class  
Remains focused on objectives  
Keeps an appropriate pace

#### PRESENTATION SKILLS

An effective speaker  
Employs appropriate rate of speech  
Uses classroom space well  
Enthusiastic about subject matter  
Command of English was adequate  
Voice is audible  
Varies tone/pitch of voice  
Avoids distracting mannerisms  
Maintains eye contact  
Avoids extensive reading from notes or texts  
Uses "note-taking" pace

#### INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Uses more than one form of instruction  
Uses appropriate teaching techniques for stated goals  
Pauses after asking questions  
Prevents specific students from dominating discussion  
Draws non-participants into discussions

Helps students to extend their responses  
Mediates conflicts or differences of opinion  
Maps the direction of the discussion  
Provides opportunity for active learning  
Provides explicit directions for active learning tasks  
Specifies how active learning will be evaluated  
Allows enough time to complete active learning task  
Facilitates group work well  
Helps students learn from each other  
Helps students apply theory to solve problems  
Develops awareness of process used to gain new knowledge

#### CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Knowledgeable of subject matter  
Information is accurate  
Incorporates current research  
Identifies sources, authorities in the field  
Communicates reasoning process behind operations/concepts  
Confident in explaining subject matter  
Focuses on important content in the field  
Demonstrates curiosity toward new ideas or perspectives  
Incorporates diverse views (such as gender, culture, race, age)  
Corrects racist or sexist bias in assigned materials

#### CLARITY

Explains subject matter clearly  
Logically organizes presentation  
Considers diverse learning styles by using multiple approaches. e.g. overheads, handouts, discussion, visuals  
Pitches instruction at an appropriate level  
Responds to questions clearly  
Emphasizes major points

Relates material to practical situations/uses examples to explain  
Defines new terms or concepts  
Elaborates or repeats complex information  
Pauses to allow students to ask questions

#### RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

Welcomes student participation  
Motivates students  
Demonstrates sense of humor  
Uses effective classroom management techniques  
Flexible in responding to student concerns  
Welcomes multiple perspectives  
Treats students impartially  
Respects constructive criticism  
Able to help many kinds of students  
Sensitive to individual interests and abilities  
Does not express sexist or racist attitudes  
Addresses students by name  
Attends to student comprehension or puzzlement  
Uses positive reinforcement  
Incorporates student ideas into class

#### INSTRUCTION IN LABS

Experiments/exercises are well chosen and well organized  
Procedures/techniques are clearly explained/demonstrated  
Thoroughly familiar with experiments, exercises, equipment, tools  
Available for assistance during experiments/exercises  
Experiments/exercises are of appropriate level of difficulty  
Experiments/exercises develop important skills  
Experiments/exercises develop confidence in subject matter  
Safety is emphasized  
Criticism of procedures/techniques is constructive  
Provides aid with interpretation of data  
Clinical or field experiences are realistic

#### OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

Describe several strengths evident in the instructor's teaching performance.  
What suggestions do you have that might aid in improving the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness?