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I. PREAMBLE

These policies and procedures for the College of Public Health are a supplement to several University documents, including:

- Chapters 5, 6 and 7 of the *Rules of the University Faculty*. These contain the additional rules of the University faculty concerning tenure-track faculty appointments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure; clinical/teaching faculty appointment, reappointment and non-reappointment, and promotion; and research faculty appointment, reappointment and non-reappointment, and promotion. They also contain the additional rules of the University faculty concerning associate faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotion.


Should university rules and policies change, the college shall 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 five years by the college Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (APT) Committee and on appointment or reappointment of the dean.

This document has been approved by the faculty, by the dean of the college, and by the executive vice president and provost of the university. Within the context of the college’s mission and the mission of the university, this document sets forth the criteria and procedures for faculty appointment, and criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure, and incentives, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and executive vice president and provost accept the mission and criteria of the college and delegate to the faculty the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

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

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

The college supports the goals of The Ohio State University for cultural diversity. With regard to faculty, the goal is achievement of equality of opportunity and enhanced excellence through diversity of faculty.

II. COLLEGE MISSION

We protect and champion the health of the people of Ohio, the nation and the world. Through education, influential research and community engagement, The Ohio State University College of Public Health shapes and enhances public health, advances equity and impacts the delivery and effectiveness of health care. We prepare the next generation of public health practitioners, health care administrators and academic scholars. We work collaboratively to make discoveries that help address existing and emerging public health threats. We advance the public health conversation and foster a culture of engagement for our students, faculty, staff, alumni and the broader community.
Values

We believe in equity for all people, that everyone should live in an environment that optimizes health and have access to affordable, high-quality health care and evidence-based knowledge of how individual behavior contributes to health.

We maintain high levels of academic and scientific integrity, pursuing innovative research that is scientifically rigorous and relevant.

We value dedicated service and leadership and seek partnerships that provide opportunities to stand in solidarity with communities, helping them to flourish.

We believe that diversity is excellence, that inclusivity promotes innovation and enriches our college and our society. We respect and embrace all forms of diversity. We are committed to increasing the diversity of our students, faculty and staff and to preparing graduates to bring their wide array of voices and experiences to the public health workforce.

Inclusive Excellence

Promoting inclusive excellence requires deliberate, intentional, and sustained engagement with diversity in ways that achieve and maintain a respectful, participatory, and emotionally and intellectually safe climate for faculty staff and students, that deepen our understanding of and ability to work successfully with a diversity of populations and perspectives, and that promote faculty, staff, and student involvement and success in the institution.

Impact

Our publications and citations represent our contributions to the academic debate, grants fund our activities, but our most important achievement is for our scholarship, teaching, and service to lead to change and improved public health. Impact in public health often involves shaping not only broad scholarly understandings of our approaches to the field, but also public health practice. Impact on the field may take the form of scholarship that advances or develops conceptual or theoretical frames, methodology, or relevant questions and lines of inquiry. Impact may take the form of either research or service commitments that develop community or private sector partnerships that promote health; contribute to solving critical problems; contribute to policy analysis, development, or change; shape the public conversation; or generate evidence that transforms or has the potential to transform practice. As faculty progress through their careers and faculty ranks, they must document their increasing impact and contributions to change and improved public health. Promotion to associate professor and professor recognizes this demonstrated and increasing impact on the science of public health and a broader impact on the health of the people of Ohio, the nation, and world.

Inclusive Excellence in Evaluation of Impact

The college is committed to principles that are core to the fair evaluation of all faculty. First, we are committed to ensuring that clearly articulated criteria are applied consistently and are grounded in evidence of impact. This commitment, however, demands flexibility if we are to overcome tendencies to prioritize evidence that confirms preexisting ideas. Because faculty members in public health often cross disciplinary boundaries, work can depart markedly from established patterns in our different disciplinary areas. Flexibility also requires explicit recognition that workloads, both formal and informal, are not always equitable and not always reflected in a candidate’s dossier. This is particularly true for women and individuals of color. While flexibility does not mean a relaxation of high standards, it does require care in avoiding a rigid approach to evaluation. Second, we are committed to a transparent review process in which all faculty are aware of the steps involved, criteria applied, and evidence considered. Both positive and negative assessments must be clearly linked to criteria and evidence and explained in writing as part of all evaluations. Transparency also requires a commitment to strict
confidentiality when it comes to searches and the thoughtful and respectful discussion of candidates. Respect for candidates should be evident in both confidential discussions and written feedback. Finally, we understand the evaluation of faculty as both a responsibility and a privilege that requires not only academic knowledge and skill, but knowledge and skill regarding best practices for equitable evaluation. Accordingly, it requires ongoing training to make us aware of sources of bias and best practices in candidate evaluation in recruitment, retention, and promotion.

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 college. The dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not vote as Eligible Faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or contract renewal.

All faculty in the college will undergo training on inclusive excellence as it relates to appointments, annual faculty reviews, and reviews for tenure and promotion. The training options and tracking will be determined by the Diversity, Equity and Inclusive Excellence Committee and the College Executive Committee. The goal will be to train faculty on best practices for ensuring a fair and unbiased review of scholarly output, teaching, and service contributions of the faculty member who is being reviewed. Training will also include effective ways people can intervene when they believe bias is interfering with a fair discussion of a faculty member’s contributions. Training will be required on a regular basis. If a faculty member does not complete the training, they have not demonstrated the knowledge required to serve. Although faculty nonetheless retain the right to participate and vote in appointment, promotion, and tenure cases regardless of completion of training, a commitment to understanding and checking cognitive biases is the most basic pillar of inclusive excellence. Annual reviews and tenure and promotion reviews are part of a faculty member’s duties. Training is an expected part of fulfilling this requirement in an effective and unbiased way. Faculty members who elect not participate in the training will not be eligible for annual merit increases that are at the discretion of the dean in consultation with the vice dean, associate deans, and the division chair.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- The first vote is for the appropriateness of an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at any rank. All tenure-track faculty whose primary appointment is in the college may cast a vote on the appropriateness of the hire, regardless of rank.
- The second vote is for the appropriateness of the proposed rank (determined by the search committee and/or division). This vote must be cast by all tenure-track faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and whose primary appointment is in the college.
- The votes will occur during the one meeting and the result from the first will be known before the second occurs.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2. Clinical/Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

• The first vote is for the appropriateness of an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at any rank. All tenure-track and clinical/teaching faculty whose primary appointment is in the college may cast a vote on the appropriateness of the hire, regardless of rank.
• The second vote is for the appropriateness of the proposed rank (determined by the search committee and/or division). This vote must be cast by all tenure-track faculty and all non-probationary clinical/teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and whose primary appointment is in the college.
• The votes will occur during the one meeting and the result from the first will be known before the second occurs.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

• The first vote is for the appropriateness of an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at any rank. All tenure-track and research faculty whose primary appointment is in the college may cast a vote on the appropriateness of the hire, regardless of rank.
• The second vote is for the appropriateness of the proposed rank (determined by the search committee and/or division). This vote must be cast by all tenure-track faculty and all non-probationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and whose primary appointment is in the college.
• The votes will occur during the one meeting and the result from the first will be known before the second occurs.

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 non-probationary 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 non-probationary research professors.

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), reappointment, and contract renewal of associated faculty members are decided by the dean, in consultation with the division chair.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the majority of Eligible Faculty in the division (all non-probationary clinical/teaching faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean and the Office of Academic Affairs.
- The votes will occur during the one meeting and the result from the first will be known before the second occurs.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, practice titles, and lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty, the Eligible Faculty shall be the eligible division faculty (all non-probationary clinical/teaching faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested).
- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the division chair, in consultation with the dean and division faculty.

B. 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 (e.g., 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 since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

When there is a question about potential conflicts that arise from the faculty member being reviewed or an Eligible Faculty member, the issue should be brought to the Division Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (in the unit where the faculty member being reviewed is appointed) at least one week in advance of the review to allow for an assessment. This assessment will include an examination of the history of collaborative funding and scholarly output and the nature of the relationships (e.g., role of each faculty member in the grants, on the publications, etc.). Open discussion among the committee members and professional judgment are required in determining whether it is appropriate for the faculty member to withdraw from a particular review. However, in situations without consensus, it is the responsibility of the division chair (of the unit where the faculty member being reviewed is appointed) with consultation from the APT Committee chair and/or Procedural Oversight Designee (POD) to remove any member of the Eligible Faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

Additional information regarding conflict of interest is found in Volume 3, section 3.9 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook.
C. Minimum Composition

In the event that the college does not have at least three Eligible Faculty members who can undertake a review, the dean, in consultation with probationary faculty in the division and the division chair, will appoint a faculty member from another college within the university.

D. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee

The college has an Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of one tenured faculty member from each division. In instances where a division does not have a tenured professor, a tenured associate professor may be elected. This member will not be present for hiring and promotion discussions related to professors. Each division shall elect its APT Committee representative from among those eligible. The term of service shall be for three years, with some of the committee elected each year. When considering cases involving clinical/teaching faculty the APT Committee may be augmented by two non-probationary clinical/teaching faculty members. When considering cases involving research faculty the APT Committee may be augmented by two non-probationary research faculty members.

E. Division Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Subcommittees (DAPTSC)

The DAPTSC assists the Eligible Faculty in managing appointments, annual reviews, promotion, and tenure issues. The DAPTSC consists of a chair (who also serves on the college APT Committee), all faculty members (including the division chair) who are eligible to vote in any given appointment, tenure, or promotion case, and one faculty member from outside the division selected by the APT Committee in consultation with the division chair and dean. In the event that a division does not have at least three Eligible Faculty members who can undertake a review, the dean, in consultation with the Eligible Faculty in the division and the division chair, will appoint a faculty member from another division within the college. The DAPTSC will follow similar procedures across divisions.

The DAPTSC will select a Procedural Oversight Designee (POD) from among the subcommittee's members for oversight of the meetings. The DAPTSC may also select additional PODs to serve as dossier coaches and for oversight of dossier materials. The responsibilities of the POD are described in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook.

The DAPTSC is responsible for an analysis of each dossier that provides a meaningful validation of the case for appointments, promotion, and tenure. A descriptive summary of the candidate's work is insufficient. The DAPTSC is responsible for identifying external reviewers and providing the list to the dean, who will solicit the letters. The DAPTSC will also determine the existence of conflicts of interest among the Eligible Faculty. Any faculty member who believes there may be a conflict of interest will be required to notify the DAPTSC at least one week in advance to allow for a review and determination to be made.

Prior to any review (annual, fourth year, promotion, tenure), the DAPTSC will judge scholarly impact in the context of the mission of the college and the expectations for the distribution of effort as reflected in the offer letter and subsequent annual review letters or other documents. The analyses, to be summarized in a written letter by the DAPTSC chair, should explain in a substantive, evidence-based fashion, the scholarship, service, and teaching contributions of the faculty member. The DAPTSC will also vote on all reviews, promotion, and tenure cases.

The DAPTSC will also have a formal role in faculty appointments, as described in Section IV, part B.
F. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the Eligible Faculty. The Eligible Faculty includes those not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the Eligible Faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the dean has approved an off-campus assignment.

Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum. These individuals will be asked to leave the meeting during the discussion of the faculty member.

G. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

The eligible faculty’s summary of the vote must include rationale for the vote, including both the majority and minority vote. This summary must allow the reader to understand the rationale for both positive and negative votes.

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

a. Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

A positive recommendation from the Eligible Faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive. In the case of joint appointments, the college must seek input from the joint-appointment tenure-initiating unit (TIU) prior to the appointment, reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, or contract renewal of that candidate.

H. Cultural Statement of Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Collegiality, courtesy, and respect for others are strongly promoted values in the College of Public Health. The college supports diverse beliefs and the free exchange of ideas and expects that faculty promote these values and apply them in a professional manner in all academic endeavors.

Both personal accomplishments and involvement as a team member are essential for excellence in teaching and mentoring, research, outreach, and/or administrative service. Each faculty member contributes indirectly to college productivity by positively influencing the productivity of other faculty. This synergism may include positive interactions in team teaching, research collaboration, mentoring, co-authorship of publications, sharing of innovative ideas in committee meetings, community and industry outreach, and other cooperative efforts that advance the missions of the division, college, and university. It is important that all faculty work toward establishing and maintaining a team culture along with an enriching and diverse intellectual working and learning environment. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the quality of academic life by participation in college governance and administrative service activities.
IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Appointment Criteria

Faculty Appointments: There are three types of faculty appointments: tenure-track faculty, clinical/teaching faculty, and research faculty. A tenure-track appointment is intended for faculty who assume the full range of faculty responsibility including scholarship, teaching, and service.

Clinical/teaching and research faculty appointments are intended for faculty who assume a narrower range of responsibility than tenure-track faculty. Clinical/teaching faculty responsibility may be focused in one of three areas: teaching, professional practice, and service with a lesser expectation of scholarship.

Research faculty responsibility is focused on scholarship with little expectation for teaching or service.

Tenure-track appointments are for 50-100% FTE while clinical/teaching and research faculty appointments are for 1-100% FTE.

All tenure-track, clinical/teaching faculty, and research faculty are expected to meet the college’s goals for inclusive excellence in scholarship, teaching, or service (depending on the expectation of the position).

Joint and courtesy appointments are available for tenure-track, clinical/teaching, or research faculty whose primary appointment is outside of the College of Public Health. Joint appointments split salary among two or more units. Courtesy appointments do not provide salary. Any joint or courtesy appointment in the College of Public Health shall be at the same rank as the primary appointment.

Associated Faculty Appointments: There are various types of associated faculty appointments, including tenure-track titles <50% FTE, clinical practice faculty, visiting faculty, adjunct faculty, and lecturer.

Associated tenure-track appointments are for faculty assuming the same range of responsibility as tenure-track faculty but whose appointment is less than 50% FTE. Associated clinical practice appointments are for individuals who either provide significant, uncompensated service for which a faculty title is needed or compensated service to the clinical instructional programs in the health sciences colleges. Clinical practice appointments are made for the period in which the service is provided. Associated adjunct appointments are for persons who provide significant, compensated or uncompensated service to the University such as teaching, advising, or as a co-investigator. Such individuals may be either non-University employees or University employees compensated on a non-instructional budget.

The University definitions of tenure-track, clinical/teaching, and research faculty, and of associated faculty, are stated in the Rules of the University Faculty 3335-5-19. The University criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty are stated in the Rules of the University Faculty 3335-6-02. The University criteria for appointment of clinical/teaching faculty are stated in the Rules of the University Faculty 3335-7-05. The University criteria for appointment of research faculty are stated in the Rules of the University Faculty 3335-7-32.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty hold appointments at 50% FTE or higher. They are appointed with the expectation that they will focus on scholarship, teaching, and service (Faculty Rule 3335-6-02). Faculty must demonstrate a commitment to the inclusive excellence goals of the college.

Instructor. Appointments at the rank of instructor should normally only be made when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. (Faculty Rule 3335-6-02). Procedures for appointment are identical to that of assistant professor. The college will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to
assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required
credentialing. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of
assistant professor by the end 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 college’s Eligible Faculty, the dean,
and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior
service credit is desirable since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for
an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the
option to be considered for early promotion.

**Assistant Professor.** Appointment as an assistant professor is based on having a doctoral degree
and evidence that the individual can perform effectively in scholarship, teaching, and service.
Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure
review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year
is possible when the DAPTSC determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior
service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of
the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except
through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

*Teaching potential:* The faculty member will be assessed for their potential to contribute to the
teaching mission of the college. Evidence will include the formal presentation at the time of the
interview.

*Research potential:* The faculty member’s research potential will be assessed based on the quality
of the dissertation, working papers, published and in press, record of funded research, achievements
from a post-doctoral appointment and from their formal presentation.

*Professional Service potential:* The faculty member’s potential to provide professional practice
and/or service to professional organizations will be considered.

**Associate Professor and Professor.** Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or
Professor and 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 college's
criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks.

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

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur.

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. Clinical/Teaching Faculty
The initial probationary contract for all clinical/teaching faculty members must be for a period of five (5) years. Reappointment is considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical/teaching assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three (3) years and for no more than five (5) years. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical/teaching professors must be for a period of at least three (3) years and no more than eight (8) years.

Tenure is not granted to clinical/teaching faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. The titles of clinical/teaching faculty in the College of Public Health are: Clinical Assistant Professor of Public Health, Teaching Assistant Professor of Public Health, Clinical Associate Professor of Public Health, Teaching Associate Professor of Public Health, Clinical Professor of Public Health, and Teaching Professor of Public Health. Clinical/teaching faculty have responsibility primarily for teaching and service activities. They are encouraged to participate in research and other scholarly activities, though not with the effort expected of tenure-track or research faculty.

Criteria for appointment for clinical/teaching faculty (Faculty Rule 3335-7-05) will be similar to those for the tenure-track faculty, but with the emphasis on inclusive excellence in teaching and practice, and with potential for scholarship in a broad sense. Appointments or transfers to the clinical/teaching faculty position will be made for individuals with the following experience or credentials:

1. Individuals engaged in activities that consist primarily of teaching and public health practice, but may also include administration, service, and scholarship.
2. An earned doctorate in a field related to public health.

**Instructor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health.** Appointment is normally made at the rank of Instructor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The college will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a four-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

**Assistant Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health.** An earned doctorate or the required licensure/certification in his or her specialty are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor of clinical/teaching public health. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

**Associate Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health and Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health.** Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health or Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health requires that the individual meets, at a minimum, the college's criteria in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship for promotion to these ranks.

3. **Research Faculty**

Appointment of research faculty entails one (1) to five (5) 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 titles of research faculty in the College of Public Health are: Research Assistant Professor of Public Health, Research Associate Professor of Public Health, and Research Professor of Public Health. Research faculty have responsibilities primarily in research...
related to the mission and goals of the college.

Criteria for appointment for research faculty (Faculty Rule 3335-7-32) emphasize accomplishments and potential for scholarship. Research faculty may engage in limited educational activities, but classroom teaching cannot be a required part of the workload. In addition, research faculty must not be engaged repeatedly in the same instructional activities as tenure-track faculty.

**Research Assistant Professor.** Appointments or transfers to the research faculty position require an earned doctorate in a field related to public health, and will be subject to these additional criteria:

*Research:* At the time of the appointment, the individual should already have demonstrated significant experience and/or potential for a productive research career, as shown by the quality of funded research, the dissertation, working papers, published and in-press work, research presentations, and evidence from postdoctoral work (if any).

*Funding:* Persons appointed to the research faculty position are expected to develop extramural support for their salary or have other (e.g., non-general funds) support. The specific time frame within which this must be accomplished, and the degree to which failure to attain that support may affect either the renewal of the appointment or the individual’s salary, will be stated clearly in the contract for the position.

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

4. **Associated Faculty Appointments**

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple of weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three (3) years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

Associated faculty appointments in the College of Public Health are in five different categories: *tenure-track titles <50% FTE, clinical practice faculty, visiting faculty, adjunct faculty* and *lecturer.*

**Tenure-Track Titles <50% FTE:** Associated tenure-track appointments are for faculty assuming the same range of responsibility as tenure-track faculty but whose appointment is less than 50% FTE. The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

**Clinical Practice Faculty** (Clinical Instructor of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor of Practice, Clinical Associate Professor of Practice, Clinical Professor of Practice): Associated clinical rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of clinical/teaching faculty. Clinical practice faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of clinical/teaching faculty.

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

Adjunct Faculty (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 college, 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.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer: Lecturers and senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. Senior lecturers are not eligible for promotion. The initial appointment for lecturers and senior lecturers should generally not exceed one year.

At a minimum, criteria for appointment of lecturers are:

At Lecturer level:
1. Master’s degree or equivalent professional degree
2. Professional experience and scholarly endeavors congruent with the anticipated contribution to the mission of the college

At the Senior Lecturer level:
1. Doctoral degree or equivalent professional degree
2. Contribution to a specific, identified aspect of the college’s programs of instruction and/or research

5. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-36. Full-time tenure track, clinical/teaching, research, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty (60) or older with ten (10) or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five (25) or more years of service.

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

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

6. Courtesy and Joint Appointments

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this college by a tenure-track, clinical/teaching, or research faculty member from another department at the university warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment or a partial FTE (joint) appointment in the college. 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. Courtesy and joint appointments are made at
the individual's current rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Appointment Procedures

The College of Public Health is committed to the creation and maintenance of a faculty that is diverse along many dimensions. Vigorous efforts will be made to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates, consistent with university policy.

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

- Recruitment of tenure-track, clinical/teaching, research, and associated faculty
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- Appointment of foreign nationals
- Letters of offer

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection. The involvement of the faculty in the appointment process should include:

1. Advising the dean regarding the need for new faculty.
2. Identifying appropriate strategies for national recruitment efforts that follow best practices for inclusive excellence in hiring.
3. Serving as a member on search committees for identified positions.
4. Identifying and recruiting a diverse pool of potential faculty candidates.
5. Reviewing the applicant pool to decide on candidates for formal interview.
6. Attending and evaluating the candidate’s public presentation.
7. Participating in the discussions of the faculty body to advise the dean regarding the appointment decision.

All searches in the College of Public Health for tenure-track faculty must conform to these guidelines:

1. The dean’s office will supply each search committee with a copy of the university rules and the standard procedures used within the college. The dean’s office will provide each faculty member with a copy of relevant literature and evidence that provides best practices on constructing job descriptions, reviewing candidate dossiers, and committee discussion.
2. Searches may be undertaken only after an assessment of need, resulting in specific job descriptions and carefully outlined expectations and may be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.
3. All searches should proceed following selection of an appropriate search committee, appointed by the dean with advice from the division in which the appointment will be made.
4. The dean appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other related fields. Search committees should be comprised of members from diverse backgrounds,
lived experiences, and scholarly expertise.

5. 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, such as that available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, is also required of all search committee members prior to any search. Trainings will be required of all search committee members prior to any search, with schedules and frequency based on University guidelines.

6. Every member of the search committee is empowered and expected to serve as an advocate for diversity. Formally, each search committee must select a diversity advocate. Either the search committee chair or the diversity advocate must meet with the dean to discuss diversity issues and best practices prior to posting a position.

7. The search committee must determine appropriate advertisement outlets for the search and include outlets that are focused on recruiting women, people from historically underrepresented groups, individuals with disabilities, and veterans. The posting 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, and 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. 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).

8. The search committee screens applications and identifies applicants (usually three to five) worthy of interview.

9. The faculty of the college should be given adequate opportunity to meet and evaluate candidates. Virtual or on-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee, graduate students, the division chair, and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates must make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship and may teach a class. 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 search committee presents a list of acceptable candidates to the DAPTSC. The DAPTSC reviews the candidate(s), takes a vote, then makes a recommendation to the APT Committee who reviews the recommended candidate(s) and takes a vote. Upon a positive vote and recommendation by the APT Committee, the Eligible Faculty will receive the materials and vote on the candidate(s) during a scheduled meeting. The dean may attend the meeting but will need to leave just prior to the vote in order for faculty to have discussions without the dean present, if they so desire.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the dean, in consultation with the division chair, decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the dean. For leadership positions within the college, the dean will also consult with the college leadership team.

In cases in which swift action is important, the dean may extend an offer to the candidate(s) with rank and tenure contingent on review and approval of the Eligible Faculty.
If the offer involves senior rank, the DAPTSC solicits external evaluation letters then reviews the candidate, takes a vote, and makes a recommendation to the division chair. The chair provides candidate materials to the APT Committee. The APT Committee must vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. After a positive vote, the Committee of Eligible Faculty reviews the materials and votes on the senior rank. If the offer involves prior service credit, the DAPTSC, APT Committee, and Eligible Faculty must vote on the appropriateness of such credit as well. The DAPTSC, APT Committee, and Eligible Faculty report a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the dean. 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.

Division chairs are advised to discuss the 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 college will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in seeking residency status for the appointee promptly and diligently.

10. When the appointment is to be a division chair or senior administrative position, the search committee presents the list of acceptable candidates to the dean. If the dean elects to move forward with the process, the candidate is sent forward to the APT Committee as outlined above. In the case of direct appointments to an administrative role, the dean will move forward after consultation with relevant faculty.

11. Announcement of a vote on a candidate for appointment must be distributed one week in advance. After appropriate discussion at a meeting of the Eligible Faculty, a secret ballot is used.

On rare occasions, special sessions of the APT Committee and the Eligible Faculty may be required to expedite this process.

2. Clinical/Teaching Faculty

Searches for clinical/teaching faculty generally proceed identically to tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate’s presentation during the on-campus interview is focused on clinical/teaching practices rather than scholarship, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the dean.

3. Research Faculty

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

4. Transfer from the Tenure-track

The college permits transfer from the tenure-track to research or clinical/teaching faculty positions if appropriate to the college’s mission and circumstances. All transfers must abide by the following:

- The request for transfer must be initiated by the tenure-track faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual’s career goals and activities have changed.
- When a tenured faculty member transfers to a research or clinical/teaching faculty
position, tenure is relinquished.

- The dean and executive vice president and provost must approve all transfers.

Transfers from a research or clinical/teaching faculty position to the tenure-track are not permitted. However, research and clinical/teaching faculty may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions, consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-7-39.

5. Associated Faculty

Recommendations for appointment of associated faculty are made based on need within the division and on the candidate’s qualifications to satisfy that need. They are decided by the division chair in consultation with the DAPTSC. The division chair will recommend appointment, reappointment, and contract renewal of all compensated associated faculty to the dean, after consultation with the division faculty. Final approval and letters of offer are issued by the dean and division chair.

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 unit and are decided by the division chair in consultation with the division faculty.

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

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

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

6. Courtesy and Joint Appointments

Recommendations for courtesy and joint appointments are based on a comprehensive assessment of each candidate’s qualifications, together with detailed evidence to support the nomination.

Divisions may propose courtesy or joint appointments for a tenure-track, clinical/teaching, or research faculty member from another Ohio State TIU. A proposal describing the academic service that justifies the appointment is considered at a DAPTSC meeting. If the proposal is approved by the DAPTSC, it goes to the APT committee for a vote on the appropriateness of the appointment, and then to the Eligible Faculty for a vote. Upon approval by the Eligible Faculty, the dean extends an offer of appointment.

The DAPTSC reviews all courtesy and joint appointments in the division annually to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the Eligible Faculty for a vote.

7. Emeritus Faculty
Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the dean outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Eligible Faculty (tenured and non-probationary clinical/teaching associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean will decide upon the request and, if appropriate, forward a recommendation to the executive vice president and provost. 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.

C. Withdrawal of Appointments

Non-probationary appointments may be withdrawn under two circumstances: financial exigency (Faculty Rule 3335-05-02) or when a faculty member has been found guilty of gross or serious incompetence, grave misconduct, or nontrivial financial fraud (Faculty Rule 3335-05-04).

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW

The annual review process reflects the college’s responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating faculty. OAA requires all tenure-track, clinical/teaching, and research faculty at all levels to be reviewed annually by the dean or designee. Annual reviews of all faculty members must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. The procedures for annual review of faculty are consistent with Faculty Rules 3335-6-03, 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 and follow the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review and Reappraisal Policy. Per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, the dean is required to include a reminder in annual review letters that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file. Faculty who are on family medical leave or parental leave during the time of the annual review will complete it after they return from leave.

The purposes of the annual review are to:

1. Review the faculty member’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and service based on the criteria described in this document.
2. Review evidence of ongoing development.
3. Review evidence of commitment to inclusive excellence.
4. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member’s work and progress for use by the dean and division chair in subsequent merit/salary consideration.
5. Provide recommendations to the faculty for development in teaching, scholarship, and service.
6. For Associate Professors, to assess progress toward promotion to the rank of Professor.
7. For Professors, to assess the overall contribution the faculty member is making to the reputation and functioning of the college and mentoring of junior faculty.

All divisions within the college must follow the requirements for annual performance and merit reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reapposition. It is the expectation of the college that annual performance and merit reviews will also be consistent with the college’s APT document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the college, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

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

The annual review procedures are described in the following sections for probationary faculty (tenure-track,
clinical/teaching, and research) and tenured, non-probationary clinical/teaching, and non-probationary research faculty in their second or subsequent term of appointment. There are two letters written for probationary faculty members (and those undergoing periodic review) during the annual review period: one by the division chair and the other by the DAPTSC with input from other faculty during the Eligible Faculty meeting.

The review of faculty occurs in the spring semester and begins with a meeting of the faculty member and division chair to discuss and evaluate the previous year’s performance. The division chair writes a detailed evaluation letter. The chair’s initial review letter is submitted to the DAPTSC. The DAPTSC (including the chair) discusses the faculty member’s documentation and the chair’s letter then evaluates the faculty member’s performance. The DAPTSC chair summarizes the faculty’s performance in writing and provides that letter to the Eligible Faculty. For the annual review process, the Eligible Faculty shall be the same as was described in Section III. Following the review of the Eligible Faculty, the final annual review letter will be updated to include the discussion of the Eligible Faculty. The annual review letter from the Eligible Faculty meeting will be edited and finalized by the APT chair then sent to the faculty member, division chair, and the dean. The faculty member may meet with an APT Committee representative and division chair to discuss the letter. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Although a single college APT Committee member serves as the Procedures Oversight Designee, all members of the Eligible Faculty must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, confidential, and free of bias. The procedures oversight designee should assure that the review process follows written procedures governing the probationary and subsequent annual reviews and that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review should first be brought to the attention of the APT Committee chair who must provide a response to the procedures oversight designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is judged not to be warranted.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, the college requires faculty members to submit the following documents to the division chair early in spring semester:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Policies and Procedures Handbook, Volume 3 (required for probationary faculty) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (non-probationary faculty)
- Updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (all faculty)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as documentation for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. See Section VI, Appointments, for details.

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

B. Annual Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

At least one week before the scheduled annual review of faculty, the APT Committee will make available to all Eligible Faculty the materials for the annual review of each probationary faculty including the dossier, teaching evaluations, and DAPTSC and division chair’s annual review letter.

The APT chair is responsible for scheduling the annual meeting for the review of probationary faculty in the spring semester and for notifying the Eligible Faculty of the date(s) and time(s) of the meeting by the
end of autumn semester. The purposes of the meeting are to discuss the annual reviews for probationary faculty and to develop a summary report and recommendations for each individual. If an Eligible Faculty member must be absent from the annual meeting, they may submit a written evaluation to be considered during the discussion.

The evaluative discussion will include an assessment of the probationary faculty member’s performance, impact, commitment to inclusive excellence, and professional development in teaching, scholarship, and service. This discussion will evaluate strengths and weaknesses, using the criteria for the relevant rank (Section VI, part A) and related documentation (Section VI, part C), including the DAPTSC and division chair’s annual review report. Following the discussion, the Eligible Faculty will vote by secret electronic ballot on whether to recommend reappointment. An open field will be included, in addition to the vote, where faculty may provide a rationale for their vote.

If there are any “no” votes, the discussion will be reopened if no substantive concerns were raised in the discussion. As a general principle, faculty members should not vote “no” without explaining their rationale. Faculty will also be encouraged to provide a rationale for any “no” vote in the anonymous survey that is used for the voting. The final APT letter must provide a written justification for any “no” votes. Similarly, a written justification for any “yes” vote or abstention may be provided.

The ballot results will be stated as part of a summary review report and recommendation to the dean. The APT Committee prepares the reports, ensuring that they reflect the discussion, voting results and recommendations made by the Eligible Faculty.

The reviews will be completed in the timeliest fashion possible and summary information communicated to the faculty member being reviewed in a meeting between an APT Committee member and the division chair (the dean’s designee). The reports are then forwarded to the dean.

The dean and chair will notify the faculty member of their reappointment decision (positive or negative) at the end of the academic year. If the recommendation is for renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The division 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 letter (along with the faculty member’s comments, if received) becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure. If a non-reappointment decision is made, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) is invoked. The faculty member will be given 10 calendar days to comment and the dean may respond; at the end of the comments period, the dean forwards the complete dossier to the Office of Academic Affairs for review where the Executive Vice President Provost will make the final decision on the case.

1. **Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty: Fourth-Year Annual Review**

   Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (C)(4) requires that the fourth-year review follow the same procedures as the sixth-year review except that external evaluations are not required. External evaluations are only solicited when either the dean 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 probationary faculty member prepares annual review materials as described in Section V, part A. Following the fourth-year review by the Eligible Faculty review body, the APT chair submits a statement of evaluation for inclusion in the dossier, which is then forwarded to the dean for review and an independent recommendation. The faculty member may request a copy of all review materials.
When the reports (by APT chair and dean) for the fourth-year review are complete, the faculty member under review is notified by the dean that the reports are available to review and the faculty member has 10 calendar days from that point to provide comments on the reports for inclusion in the dossier. If the faculty member provides written comments, the dean may provide a written response and/or the Eligible Faculty may reconvene and consider the candidate’s comments and provide a written response.

All fourth-year reviews and non-reappointment decisions from other probationary review years will be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs, for the executive vice president and provost’s decision. If an appointment is not renewed, standards of notice will be in accord with Faculty Rule 3335-6-08.

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. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

Review procedures discussed in this section apply to tenured faculty in the college with the exception of the dean. All annual reviews include a face-to-face meeting with the chair. For faculty holding administrative appointments (vice deans, associate/assistant deans, and division chairs), the review encompasses their performance as faculty members in teaching, scholarship, and service, but not their administrative performance. Allowance will be made in the review for the effort involved in administrative activity. Reviews need not be undertaken for faculty who have announced retirement or resignation. However, a review will be completed if the college intends to rehire the faculty member post-retirement.

Associate Professors will be reviewed every two years by the eligible Professors. The purpose of the review of Associate Professors is to assess progress toward promotion to the rank of Professor. The APT Committee will prepare a summarizing report that will be provided to the faculty member, division chair, and dean.

Faculty to be reviewed by the Eligible Faculty will be notified by the first Friday of spring semester. By the first annual review deadline set by the college, faculty undergoing a review will submit to the APT Committee chair the documentation described in Section V, part A above. The division 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 will be reviewed annually by the division chair and every five years by the dean. The purpose of the review of Professors is to assess the overall contribution the faculty member is making to the reputation and functioning of the college across the areas of scholarship, teaching, advising, service to the profession and the community, service to the college and University, and mentoring of junior faculty. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence and ongoing outcomes in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by ongoing national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and ongoing outstanding service to the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the
recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the
expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of
the faculty. The division chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations.
The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

D. Annual Review of Clinical/Teaching Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for clinical/teaching probationary and non-probationary
faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, with the
exception that clinical/teaching associate professors are reviewed by the Eligible Faculty only in their
penultimate year.

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

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. During
the penultimate year of any term the procedures for review are the same as those for probationary faculty
described in Section V, part B.1. For each positive recommendation in the penultimate year, an original
signed cover sheet (Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment) shall be
submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs, but no letters, vita or dossiers are required. For a negative
recommendation, the terms of the contract will be honored.

E. Annual Review of Research Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for research probationary and non-probationary faculty
is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, except in the penultimate year of any
term.

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the dean 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. During
the penultimate year of any term the procedures for review are the same as those for probationary faculty
described in Section V, part B.1. For each positive recommendation in the penultimate year, an original
signed cover sheet (Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment) shall be
submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs, but no letters, vita or dossiers are required. For a negative
recommendation, the terms of the contract will be honored.

F. Associated, Courtesy, and Joint Faculty

Associated, courtesy, and joint faculty members must be reviewed annually. The division chair prepares a
written evaluation and communicates the evaluation to the faculty member.

For reappointment, the division chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the
recommendation is to renew, the division chair may extend a multiple year appointment.
G. Salary Recommendations

The division chairs will provide the dean with their annual report for each faculty member, together with the faculty member’s documentation of annual accomplishments. Based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months, the dean will determine the level of merit salary increase based on the recommendation of the division chair and faculty performance. This recommendation will be based on the rank-appropriate annual review summary.

Decisions regarding merit increases require the submission by the faculty member of adequately documented annual review materials as outlined in Section V, part A above. Therefore, merit increases will not be awarded to faculty who do not submit these materials according to the timeline.

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

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

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

This section of the document adheres to and amplifies this rule in addition to 3335-07-08 and 3335-07-36. College criteria are used in conjunction with the Office of Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Dossier Checklist. These criteria are the standards upon which judgments are based. Further, examples of evidence of attainment are provided as guidelines and are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive. Candidates for promotion on tenure track lines should demonstrate high, rank-appropriate performance that has impact and demonstrates inclusive excellence. The three areas that are evaluated include scholarly activity, teaching, and service. It is assumed that, at each rank, a candidate will have successfully met the criteria stated for lower ranks. In all cases, evidence of a sustained pattern in the quality of faculty effort and leadership is required for reappointment (in untenured positions) or promotion at any academic rank.

Given that work in public health, by its very nature, crosses disciplines, the “field of public health” is necessarily a broad, flexible term. In some instances, it will intersect significantly with traditional academic disciplines. In others, it may represent a unique area that a candidate has carved out within public health. It may represent the novel merger of two fields. Excellence in public health often involves shaping not only broad scholarly understandings of or approaches to the field, but also public health practice.

Candidates, in consultation with senior faculty and administrators, are responsible for contextualizing contributions and identifying and defining the most relevant evidence. Most candidates will not be equally strong across teaching, scholarship, and service. Ultimate committee and administrative judgements involve qualitative interpretation and decision-making in which performance is evaluated within the context of a candidate’s rank and fields or sub-field.
A. Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion

1. Tenure-Track Faculty: Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Tenure and promotion are based on performance, impact, and demonstrated commitment to inclusive excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service and a pattern of performance over the probationary period that yields a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally. 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. Evidence must also indicate that the faculty member can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the College of Public Health (adapted from Faculty Rule 3335-6-02). Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. In addition, faculty are expected to contribute to the positive culture of the College of Public Health and its demonstrated commitment to inclusive excellence.

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.

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

2. Tenure-track Faculty: Promotion to Professor with Tenure

Promotion to the rank of Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in scholarship and impact in teaching, has developed and maintained a productive program of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally, and has demonstrated significant leadership in service. Time in rank is not sufficient for promotion: promotion to professor requires continued demonstration of significant achievement. A faculty member ready for promotion to Professor should be a role model for faculty, for students, and for the profession (adapted from Faculty Rule 3335-6-02). In addition, faculty are expected to contribute to the positive culture of the College of Public Health and its demonstrated commitment to inclusive excellence.

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

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

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

3. Clinical/Teaching Faculty: Promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health

Promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence and impact in teaching as demonstrated through contributions to advancing the teaching mission, and service or professional practice, and has contributed to the scholarly mission of the college. Evidence must also indicate that the faculty member can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, service or professional practice, and contributions to scholarship relevant to the mission of the college. In addition, faculty are expected to contribute to the positive culture of the College of Public Health and its demonstrated commitment to inclusive excellence.

4. Clinical/Teaching Faculty: Promotion to Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health

Promotion to Professor of Clinical/Teaching Public Health must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence and impact in teaching as demonstrated through innovative methods; recognition for excellence and leadership in service or professional practice, and has contributed regularly to the scholarly mission of the college. In addition, faculty are expected to contribute to the positive culture of the College of Public Health and its demonstrated commitment to inclusive excellence.

5. Research Faculty: Promotion to Research Associate Professor

Promotion to Research Associate Professor is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence and impact as a scholar, demonstrated both by the quality of the work and the ability to attract external support. Evidence must also indicate that the faculty member can be expected to continue a program of high-quality scholarship supported by external funding, and to contribute to the mission of the college. In addition, faculty are expected to contribute to the positive culture of the College of Public Health and its demonstrated commitment to inclusive excellence.

6. Research Faculty: Promotion to Research Professor

Promotion to Research Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence and impact in scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally, including a continuous record of success in obtaining external research support from high-quality sources, and contributions to the mission of the college. Persons holding this rank should be recognized clearly as leaders in their field, whose presence substantially enhances the research program of the college, including the mentoring of others. In addition, faculty are expected to contribute to the positive culture of the College of Public Health and its demonstrated commitment to inclusive excellence.

7. Associated Faculty

The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members are the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.
The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

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

B. Procedures

The college’s procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are consistent with and supplement those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

1. Tenure-Track, Clinical/Teaching, and Research Faculty

Candidate Responsibilities

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

Dossier

Every candidate must submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. This must include a clear statement of a candidate’s scholarly trajectory, key areas of impact, and evidence of impact. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist. While the APT Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that they should complete.

Listed below are the possible forms of documentation to be included in the dossier in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Documentation for tenure-track, clinical/teaching and research faculty are listed separately.

Tenure-Track Faculty

Reputation as an independent scholar and researcher who advances the field is a cornerstone for tenure and promotion. To be considered for promotion and tenure, candidates should have achieved widely recognized excellence in advancing a body of work judged to be substantial, original (pioneering or innovative), and setting the highest standard for scholarship (in the development or application of relevant concepts, theory, and/or methods) in the field of public health. Candidates are expected to demonstrate clear evidence of intellectual independence as reflected in scholarly accomplishments. Faculty being considered for promotion to the associate level with tenure should have, at least, emerging national or international reputations. Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national or international reputations.

Teaching
Effective teaching is an essential responsibility of all faculty members in the College of Public Health. The quality of teaching is an explicit factor in the evaluation of faculty performance for merit salary increases, promotion, and tenure. Teaching includes undergraduate and graduate instruction in formal courses, seminars, and individual studies. Directing student research, including undergraduates, is both a research and teaching activity. Advising students or discipline-centric student organizations, and academic/career counseling (graduate and undergraduate) is a teaching activity. Student evaluations of formal classroom or lab instruction alone are not sufficient to judge instructional proficiency.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present.

Evidence of exceptional teaching (demonstrated by student or peer recognition of creativity and commitment to teaching) is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in extraordinary circumstances can exceptional teaching provide the grounds for promotion to professor. “Exceptional” performance in one dimension cannot compensate for “inadequate” performance in another.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document both the scope and the impact of their teaching. The Teaching Narrative in the dossier should be used to document both scope and impact of teaching. The Teaching Narrative should include, but is not limited to, the following sections:

1. Teaching Philosophy detailing the faculty member’s approach and goals in teaching.
2. Scope of Classroom Teaching. The college requires that all faculty teach and take responsibility for the equivalent of at least one full course per year. While the nature of the classroom continues to evolve with online, distance formats, and team teaching, faculty must demonstrate how their teaching contributions exceed the college’s expectations. For example, an explanation would be required for courses with frequent guest lecturers or online courses designed and prepared by another faculty member.
3. Scope of Non-Classroom Teaching. A tenure track faculty member’s teaching responsibilities extend beyond the classroom and can range from the mentoring of student research to development of new student-based or community-based curricula. This section should include contributions to the university’s broader public university teaching mission and can include, but are not limited to:
   - Contributions to curricula development and implementation, online degrees, and open-access courses.
   - Participating in the creation of new undergraduate, graduate and professional majors, minors, certificates, and degrees that are interdisciplinary and involve courses with multiple instructors.
   - Creative expression in course development with regard to new materials, ideas and methods of delivery.
4. Mentoring and Advising. There should be evidence of the capacity to successfully mentor doctoral students, when applicable. For faculty who work primarily or even exclusively with MPH or undergraduate students, mentoring can be demonstrated in other ways (e.g., publications with students documenting the student contribution, independent student publications, student accomplishments, etc.). As with scholarship, quality matters more than quantity. Candidates for professor are expected to have chaired or co-chaired doctoral student committees or demonstrate successful student mentoring in other dimensions. Candidates for promotion to professor must not only demonstrate the capacity to mentor students, but also junior faculty members. Again, the quality of mentorship is vital and mentorship in name only is insufficient. Examples include:
• Mentoring of graduate teaching assistants and advising (Discipline specific or Interdisciplinary) undergraduate and/or graduate students.
• Directing graduate and undergraduate research programs/activities.
• Serving as a mentor in the Second Year Transformational Experience Program (STEP) or as an advisor to recognized and sanctioned student organizations.

5. Creating partnerships and exchanges, including study abroad, with other academic and research institutions across the region, nation, and world.


7. Evidence of Teaching Impact and Teaching Accomplishments. The college requires that every faculty member must be an effective teacher. This section of the Teaching Narrative should document the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness through their impact and teaching accomplishments. The following items should be considered in compiling documentation in the area of instruction:
• REQUIRED: Peer evaluations of teaching, in line with the process described in Section IX, part B below.
• REQUIRED: Course and instructor evaluations. Student opinions and judgments, appropriately documented and accompanied by interpretive information, are essential. See Section IX, part A below. Any other information that the candidate may wish to submit.
• Evidence of the development of new and effective instructional techniques and materials, shown through written explanation by the candidate, including syllabi, examinations, and assignments.
• Teaching in teams with community partners as an engaged university.
• Recognition or awards for distinguished teaching or mentoring (in any of the above-mentioned categories).
• Instruction-related publications authored, co-authored or edited: number, scope, and distribution:
  – Peer-evaluated publications designed primarily to communicate with other educators, e.g., journal articles on curricula, course innovations, and student placement.
  – Textbooks, chapters in textbooks, or peer-evaluated books of readings.
  – Articles, papers, reviews, and other non-reviewed class materials.
  – Academic advising, mentoring, and direction of undergraduate and graduate students in research papers, thesis, and dissertations, including the achievements of these students.
  – Leadership in development of courses and curricula (in any of the above-mentioned categories) that goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations.

8. Evidence of inclusive excellence in teaching and advising. The following areas can be considered when describing contributions to inclusive excellence in teaching and advising:
• Serving a student body that is diverse in a multitude of ways (race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age, religion, academic preparedness, disability, gender expression, or non-traditional differences).
• Working with any students in a mentorship or advisory capacity who have faced structural barriers in higher education.
• Course design that addresses considerations of diversity and equity.
• Teaching in a way that creates a welcoming and inclusive atmosphere.
• Facilitating a discussion (and/or structuring active learning activities) in a way that takes into account considerations of positionality, power, and/or diversity.
• Incorporating dialogue about diversity into courses.
Indicators of Outstanding Merit

1. Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.
2. Selection for a teaching award at the departmental, college, university, or professional society level.
3. Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
4. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
5. Developing a new course or course sequence that fills an identified need in the curriculum.
6. Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
7. Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
8. Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member’s students.
9. Evidence of exceptional service as a peer evaluator.

Indicators of Merit

1. Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.
2. Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
3. Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
4. Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation.
5. Evidence of high-quality class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments.
6. Effectively coordinating a multi-section course.
7. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
8. Receiving, on a competitive basis, internal funding for teaching.
9. Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
10. Evidence of effective service as a peer evaluator.

Mentorship-Indicators of mentorship include but are not limited to the following:

Indicators of Outstanding Merit

1. Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated and communicated by peers.
2. Evidence of outstanding advising of doctoral student research.
3. Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions.
4. Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g., working with the College or University Honors program).
5. Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).

Indicators of Merit

1. Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction (involving appropriate comparisons to department norms) and student outcomes.
2. Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research.
3. Member of graduate student advisory committees.
4. Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).
5. Research mentorship of undergraduate students.
Scholarship

Each faculty member is required to make significant contributions to the body of knowledge in their field of expertise. While the same level of achievement is not likely to be evaluated equally from discipline to discipline within the college, evidence of high-quality scholarship and commitment to inclusive excellence should be universally recognized. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document both the scope and the impact of their research. The Research Narrative in the dossier should be used to document both scope and impact of research. The time period for scholarship documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured 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. Such documentation is likely to include:

1. Demonstration of scholarship that enhances diversity in thought and people.
2. Positive evaluation of the faculty member’s scholarly productivity, impact, and commitment to inclusive excellence from independent experts in the candidate’s scholarly area.
3. Consistent record of publication of scholarship in high impact journals in the faculty member’s field. A majority of these publications should feature the faculty member as first, second or senior author.
4. Evidence that the faculty member’s published scholarship is frequently cited by other scholars in the field.
5. Evidence that the faculty member’s published or public-facing scholarship is used by public health practitioners outside of academia in service of the public’s health.
6. Applying for and, ultimately, obtaining scientifically meritorious peer-reviewed research grants.
7. Applying for and, ultimately, obtaining scientifically meritorious funding (including foundation) for scholarship that promotes inclusive excellence.
8. Providing research mentorship to students and colleagues, and recognition by colleagues at national and/or international levels in an area of scholarship in which they are an expert.
9. Awards received in recognition for outstanding scholarship and innovation.
10. Serving as principal investigator on funded grants or contracts; and/or serving as a major scientific contributor on a funded research grant.
11. Indications of scholarly reputation among peers. These would include:
   • Invitations to speak at or lead sessions at national or international scientific meetings.
   • Invitations to speak to community-based stakeholders, policy makers, or public health practitioners.
   • Invitations to participation on advisory committees, peer review groups, and editorial boards of well-respected journals in the discipline.
   • Elections to leadership positions in professional societies.
12. Evidence of inclusive excellence in scholarship. Some indicators to consider are:
   • Scholarship that directly addresses issues of diversity, inclusion, or equity.
   • Scholarship that addresses issues specific to groups that have historically faced structural barriers.
   • Scholarship that has been shared with the community in a way that promotes access.
   • Scholarship that involves collaboration with diverse groups of colleagues.
   • Scholarship that includes novel methodologies, societies, cultures, or geographies that expand existing scholarship.

Scholarship may be individual, focusing on new methodologies or summarizing the current state of
research in a field, or collaborative as part of a team. Interdisciplinary scholarship is recognized as an important mechanism for advancing science. Community-engaged work, particularly in public health, is recognized as critical both for advancing science and for achieving inclusive excellence. Interdisciplinary scholarship and community-engaged scholarship are key to achieving impact. Both individual and collaborative efforts are important. Published papers in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals is an important indicator of a high level of research productivity, the faculty member’s contributions to those published papers is of utmost importance. Scholarly impact can be realized through (1) publication in the peer-reviewed literature, and (2) via policy- and practice-relevance.

1. Publications

A general hierarchy of publication significance for scholarship is listed below. There may be some variation in this hierarchy according to the specific discipline.

Greatest weight is placed on peer-reviewed, original, research publications that have significant impact on the field, for example:

- Publication of peer-reviewed empirical research in top-tier scientific journals, as determined by the field of study. Manuscripts accepted for publication, documented by copies of correspondence from the publisher, will be treated as publications for the purpose of evaluation for scholarship performance.
- Publication of peer-reviewed books or monographs.
- Publication of peer-reviewed critical summary or review articles.
- Publication of peer-reviewed national reports.
- Publication of, as first or second author, an authoritative textbook, distributed internationally, in the faculty member’s area if expertise. Peer-reviewed manuscripts, dealing with specific aspects of the textbook, should also be produced.

Less stringently reviewed publications that may still contain significant contributions could include:

- Book chapters from major academic press companies.
- Invited or selected papers presented at professional meetings.
- Textbooks, edited volumes, and materials that are intended to be primarily instructional insofar as they present new ideas or constitute conceptual or empirical innovation.
- Manuscripts in review.

Additional materials, which may be considered, include:

- Publications that are not peer-reviewed.
- Unpublished papers if the author demonstrates their quality and usefulness.
- Book reviews written for journals, which reflect the author’s status as a scholar but may occasionally also represent research output.

The order of authorship for papers with multiple authors will also be considered in the review process. Dossiers should make clear the authorship traditions of the field. In general, order of authorship reflects the relative contribution to the research and/or the writing of the paper. It is essential for the candidate to describe his or her contribution to a publication with multiple authors.

2. Evidence of policy- and practice-relevant scholarship

- Use of faculty member’s scholarship by policy makers in policymaking, lawmaking, or litigation.
• Use of a faculty member’s scholarship in teaching practices, approaches, and content.
• Published op-eds, opinion pieces, or blog posts relating to scholarship.
• Interviews in news outlets or podcasts relating to scholarship.
• Reports, presentations, or seminars relating to scholarship used by local, county, and state government.
• Reports, presentations, or seminars relating to scholarship used by public-health practitioners.

3. Grants and Contracts
Grants and contracts are a mechanism to support investigations of significant public health problems and they represent an assessment of merit by peers in the field. Funding may be derived from a variety of sources. In evaluating sources of funding, competitiveness of the source and the role of the faculty member are major criteria. The general hierarchy is presented below.

• Principal/Co-principal Investigator of an externally funded, peer-reviewed research grant. Examples include federal sources (e.g., NIH, CDC, NSF, EPA, DOD, USDA) or foundations (e.g., Robert Wood Johnson, Annie E. Casey, Kellogg).
• Other examples include:
  – Significant member of an externally funded, peer-reviewed research grant.
  – Principal/Co-principal Investigator of an internally funded research grant.
  – Significant member of an internally funded research grant.
  – Non-peer reviewed external contracts and grants.

4. Scholarly Activities with Students
Publications co-authored with students are a reflection of a faculty member’s mentorship. The quality of the students’ work, including research awards, publications, and future success; the recruitment of students; and involvement of students in research and other scholarly activities are all critical activities that reflect a faculty member’s mentorship and program of research and scholarship. For promotion to Professor, the faculty member’s involvement with students is crucial; specifically, there should be evidence of student accomplishment. Examples of student success may include but are not limited to: 1) high quality scholarship that has an impact on the science; 2) record of scholarship; 3) job placement; and 4) contributions to the profession. These accomplishments reflect on the faculty candidate’s commitment and ability to mentor students in the areas of teaching, research, scholarship, and service.

5. Other Scholarly Activities
Excellence in scholarship is manifested in other ways, depending on the faculty member’s field of expertise and the stage of one’s professional development. For example, a candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to provide mentorship to junior faculty and facilitate the research expertise of colleagues. Among other indicators of the quality of a scholarship program are attracting funds, consultation in areas of research expertise and/or clinical/teaching expertise, participating in research with community partners as an engaged university, serving on expert panels in the area, giving invited lectures at scientific meetings, receiving recognition for research and scholarly contributions to science and the discipline, patents and patent preparation, commercialization of published research, and software development.

Service
Evidence of excellent service is an expectation of all tenure-track and tenured faculty for
consideration of promotion in the College of Public Health. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate increasing involvement and leadership in service as they progress in rank.

At the level of **associate professor**, evidence of service may include contributions to professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g., search committees), serving on boards of community-based organizations, journal manuscript review, etc. Likewise, service may entail participation in major conferences and serving on task forces.

At the level of **professor**, service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for tenure and/or promotion for faculty on tenured or tenure-track lines. Only in *extraordinary circumstances* can exceptional service, defined as sustained service to the institution or the field that is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding, provide the grounds alone for promotion to professor. Clearing such a high bar would be exceptionally rare.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of services are described below. Services include but are not limited to those specified.

1. **Promotion to Associate Professor.** Actively participates in college events, assists with recruitment of students and faculty, advises student organizations, and contributes in an administrative capacity. Involvement in professional organizations, serving on a task force, playing a role in organizing a professional conference, review of journal articles, and participation on grant study sections. Membership on boards and committees and participates with events or projects by community organizations.

2. **Promotion to Professor.** Service should represent high-level leadership through: chairing division, college, or university committees; participating on university committees; contributing to faculty governance; mentoring junior faculty. Service outside of the university includes active participation in professional organizations at the national level (chairing a significant national or international committee), service on site visit committees, service as a member of a study section for federal funding agencies (e.g., NIH, NSF, AHRQ, NIOSH, OSHA, USDA), service as a member of an editorial board of a recognized professional peer-reviewed journal, service on a regional/national policy-making committee, service on boards and committees, and leadership in events or projects by community organizations (including public health departments, health coalitions, etc.).

3. **Inclusive excellence in service.** All faculty are expected to demonstrate inclusive excellence in service. The ways in which faculty can document these contributions to service are the following:
   - Participation in service activities (e.g., university committees, symposiums, workshops, volunteer work in the community) whose goals relate to diversity, inclusion, and equity.
   - Leadership contributions toward the diversity and inclusion goals of division or college or at the university or community level.
   - Serving as an advocate for diversity on a search committee (if applicable).
   - Engaging in diversity and inclusion-related professional development activities, including those that are part of the Community of Inclusion.

**Clinical/Teaching Faculty**

Clinical/Teaching faculty who are candidates for promotion on non-tenure-accruing track lines should demonstrate excellence in one area in addition to teaching. These areas include service, administration, or community engagement. Expectations are not, however, necessarily limited to only
Effective teaching is an essential responsibility of all faculty members in the College of Public Health. The quality of teaching is an explicit factor in the evaluation of faculty performance for merit salary increases and promotion. Teaching includes undergraduate and graduate instruction in formal, interprofessional, or facilitated courses, seminars, individual studies and/or training with Undergraduate and Graduate students. Directing student research is both a research and teaching activity. Advising students or discipline-centric student organizations, and career counseling (graduate and undergraduate) is a teaching activity. It is the responsibility of the clinical/teaching faculty member to document both the scope and the impact of their teaching. The Teaching Narrative in the dossier should be used to document both scope and impact of teaching. The Teaching Narrative should include, but is not limited to, the following sections.

1. Command of subject including incorporation of recent developments into instruction.
2. Continuous growth in subject matter knowledge.
3. Organization and presentation of class material.
4. Contributions to curricula development; online degrees and open-access courses.
5. Participating in the creation of new undergraduate, graduate and professional majors, minors, certificates and degrees that are interdisciplinary and involve courses with multiple instructors.
6. Creative expression in course development with regard to new materials, ideas and methods of delivery.
7. Capacity to awaken students’ awareness of the relationship between subjects studied, important problems and other fields of knowledge.
8. Advising (discipline-specific or interdisciplinary) undergraduate and/or graduate students.
9. Mentoring of graduate teaching assistants.
10. Creating partnerships and exchanges, including study abroad, with other academic and research institutions across the region, nation, and world.
11. Evidence of inclusive excellence in teaching and advising. The following areas can be considered when describing contributions to inclusive excellence in teaching.
   • Serving a student body that is diverse in a multitude of ways (race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age, religion, academic preparedness, disability, gender expression, or non-traditional differences).
   • Working with any students in a mentorship or advisory capacity who have faced structural barriers in higher education.
   • Course design that addresses considerations of diversity and equity.
   • Teaching in a way that creates a welcoming and inclusive atmosphere.
   • Facilitating a discussion (and/or structuring active learning activities) in a way that takes into account considerations of positionality, power, and/or diversity.
   • Incorporating dialogue about diversity into courses.

Each clinical/teaching faculty member will describe their teaching impact and submit evidence concerning performance in instruction. The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present.

The following items should be considered in compiling documentation in the area of instruction:
1. Peer evaluations of teaching, in line with the peer review process described in Section IX.
2. Course and instructor evaluations.
3. Student opinions and judgments, appropriately documented and accompanied by
interpretive information, are essential. See Section IX on evaluation of teaching. Any other information that the candidate may wish to submit.

4. Evidence of the development of new and effective instructional techniques and materials, shown through written explanation by the candidate, including syllabi, examinations, and assignments.

5. Teaching in teams with community partners as an engaged university.

6. Number of courses and sections taught, and number of students enrolled.

7. Recognition or awards for distinguished teaching (in any of the above-mentioned categories).

8. Instruction-related publications authored, co-authored or edited: number, scope and distribution:

9. Peer-evaluated publications designed primarily to communicate with other educators, e.g., journal articles on curricula, course innovations, and student placement.

10. Textbooks, chapters in textbooks or peer-evaluated books of readings.

11. Articles, papers, reviews and other non-reviewed class materials.

12. Academic advising of undergraduate and graduate students.

13. Counseling of graduate and undergraduate students in career development.

14. Maintenance and development of competence through workshops, study leaves, courses, interactions with practitioners, and self-study.

15. Leadership in development of courses and curricula (in any of the above-mentioned categories) that goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations.

Scholarship

Clinical/teaching faculty members are expected to contribute to the university’s mission via teaching and service and may make contributions to scholarship. They are also expected to contribute to the scholarly mission of the college in ways appropriate to their other activities. The time period for scholarship documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Scholarship may take such forms as:

1. Developing and disseminating educational innovations.

2. Collaboration with others in research activity.

3. Publishing in the professional practice literature.

4. Giving presentations at professional meetings.

5. Developing continuing education offerings.

6. Demonstrating scholarship that enhances diversity in thought and people.

7. Community-engaged work, particularly as it advances inclusive excellence.

Scholarly impact can be realized through publication in the peer-reviewed literature, and via policy-and practice-relevance. The following are also important and should be considered when describing the impact of scholarship:

1. Evidence that the faculty member’s published or public-facing scholarship is used by public health practitioners outside of academia in service of the public’s health.

2. Providing research mentorship to students and other faculty from historically underrepresented groups.

3. Evidence of inclusive excellence in scholarship. Some indicators to consider are:
   - Scholarship that directly addresses issues of diversity, inclusion, or equity.
   - Scholarship that addresses issues specific to groups that have historically faced structural barriers.
   - Scholarship that has been shared with the community in a way that promotes access.
   - Scholarship that involves collaboration with diverse groups of colleagues.
• Scholarship that includes novel methodologies, societies, cultures, or geographies that expand existing scholarship.

Service

Clinical/teaching faculty members are expected to demonstrate increasing involvement and leadership in service as they progress in rank. Evidence of service may include contributions to professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g., search committees), serving on boards of community-based organizations, journal manuscript review, etc. Likewise, service may entail participation in major conferences and serving on task forces. Examples of services are described below. Services include, but are not limited to, those specified. The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor. Actively participates in college events, assists with recruitment of students, advises student organizations, and contributes in an administrative capacity. Involvement in professional organizations, serving on a task force, playing a role in organizing a professional conference, and membership on boards and committees and participates with events or projects by community organizations (including public health departments, health coalitions, etc.).

2. Promotion to Professor. Service should represent high-level leadership. Actively participates by chairing college committees, participating on committees at the University level, serving on the Diversity, Equity and Inclusive Excellence Committee or other standing or ad hoc committee, contributes to faculty governance, and the mentoring of junior faculty and graduate students primarily in teaching. Service in professional organizations at the national level (chairing a significant national or international committee committee), or site visit committee, participation on a regional/national policy-making committee, or chairing boards and committees and leading events or projects by community organizations (including public health departments, health coalitions, etc.).

3. Inclusive excellence in service. All faculty are expected to demonstrate inclusive excellence in service. The ways in which faculty can document these contributions to service are the following:
   • Participation in service activities (e.g., university committees, symposiums, workshops, volunteer work in the community) whose goals relate to diversity, inclusion, and equity.
   • Leadership contributions toward the diversity and inclusion goals of division or college or at the university or community level.
   • Serving as an advocate for diversity on a search committee (if applicable).
   • Engaging in diversity and inclusion-related professional development activities, including those that are part of the Community of Inclusion.

Research Faculty

Scholarship

Research and scholarship are considered the primary expectations for research faculty in the College of Public Health. Each research faculty member is expected to develop and support a research program that focuses on significant public health and health care problems and is congruent with the mission of the College of Public Health. Research faculty may also participate in “team science” initiatives in basic, translational and applied research, and focus on university and other
interdisciplinary scientific initiatives.

Written accounts of research published in peer-reviewed, high-quality scholarly publications are an important indicator of research productivity. Other indicators that a research faculty member is growing professionally include rigorous external peer-reviewed funding of research grants, the provision of research mentorship to students and colleagues, and recognition by colleagues at national and/or international levels in an area of scholarship in which they are an expert. The time period for scholarship documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For non-probationary 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.

Guidelines for evaluating scholarship include publications, grants, and research activities include:

**Publications**

A general hierarchy of publication significance for scholarship is listed below. There may be some variation in this hierarchy according to the specific discipline. Greatest weight is placed on peer-reviewed, original, research publications that have significant impact on the field, for example:

1. Publication of peer-reviewed empirical research in top-tier scientific journals, as determined by the field of study. Manuscripts accepted for publication, documented by copies of correspondence from the publisher, will be treated as publications for the purpose of evaluation for scholarship performance.
2. Publication of peer-reviewed books or monographs.
3. Publication of peer-reviewed critical summary or review articles.
4. Publication of peer-reviewed national reports.
5. Publication of, as first or second author, an authoritative textbook, distributed internationally, in the faculty member’s area of expertise. Peer-reviewed manuscripts, dealing with specific aspects of the textbook, should also be produced.

**Grants and Contracts**

Grants and contracts are a mechanism to support investigations of significant public health problems and they represent an assessment of merit by peers in the field. Funding may be derived from a variety of sources. In evaluating sources of funding, competitiveness of the source and the role of the faculty member are major criteria. The general hierarchy is presented below.

1. Principal/Co-principal Investigator of an externally funded, peer reviewed research grant. Examples include federal sources (e.g., NIH, CDC, NSF, EPA, DOD, USDA) or foundations (e.g., Robert Wood Johnson, Annie E. Casey, Kellogg).
2. Other examples include:
   - Significant member of an externally funded, peer-reviewed research grant.
   - Principal/Co-principal Investigator of an internally funded research grant.
   - Significant member of an internally funded research grant.
   - Non-peer reviewed external contracts and grants.

**Scholarly Activities with Students**

Publications co-authored with students are a reflection of a faculty member’s mentorship. The quality of the students’ work, including research awards, publications, and future success; the recruitment of students; and involvement of students in research and other scholarly activities are all critical activities that reflect a faculty member’s mentorship and program of research and scholarship. For promotion to Professor, the faculty member’s involvement with students is crucial; specifically, there should be evidence of student accomplishment. Examples of student success may include, but are not limited to: 1) high-quality scholarship that has an impact on the science; 2) record of scholarship; 3)
job placement; and 4) contributions to the profession. These accomplishments reflect on the faculty candidate’s commitment and ability to mentor in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Other Scholarly Activities
Excellence in scholarship is manifested in other ways, depending on the faculty member’s field of expertise and the stage of one’s professional development. For example, a candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to provide mentorship to junior faculty and facilitate the research expertise of colleagues. Among other indicators of the quality of a scholarship program are: attracting funds, consultation in areas of research expertise and/or clinical/teaching expertise, participating in research with community partners as an engaged university, serving on expert panels in the area, giving invited lectures at scientific meetings, receiving recognition for research and scholarly contributions to science and the discipline, patents and patent preparation, commercialization of published research, and software development.

Inclusive Excellence in Scholarship
Research faculty are expected to demonstrate inclusive excellence in scholarship. Some indicators to consider are:
1. Scholarship that directly addresses issues of diversity, inclusion, or equity.
2. Scholarship that addresses issues specific to groups that have historically faced structural barriers.
3. Scholarship that has been shared with the community in a way that promotes access.
4. Scholarship that involves collaboration with diverse groups of colleagues.
5. Scholarship that includes novel methodologies, societies, cultures, or geographies that expand existing scholarship.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document
Candidates must also submit a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the college’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. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the college.

External Evaluations
Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the candidate’s DAPTSC and dean. 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 dean and division chair decide whether removal is justified. (Also see #7 External Evaluations below.)

2. The DAPTSC Responsibilities (substantive review for candidates in the division)

a. Annually, provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
   1. Late Spring: Suggest names of external evaluators to the dean.
   2. Late Summer: 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.
b. 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.

c. Draft an analysis of the candidate’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to
provide to the Eligible Faculty with the dossier and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in
the case, where possible. The analysis of the case must demonstrate engagement with the
candidate’s submitted articles. This must go beyond a simple summary but must discuss the
impact and importance of the work. The committee will take a preliminary vote and include the
vote in the letter (NOTE: the official faculty vote occurs during the meeting of Eligible
Faculty).

d. Revise the draft analysis of each case following the Eligible Faculty meeting, to include the
faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and
forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the dean.

e. Provide a written response, on behalf of the Eligible Faculty, to any candidate comments that
warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier. The DAPTSC chair will present conclusions
orally to the APT Committee. The chair may bring a faculty member from another unit at Ohio
State with subject matter expertise to answer questions about the faculty member’s scholarly
contributions.

3. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the APT Committee are as follows:

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

b. 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.

1. 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) and the
recommendation of the DAPTSC. Faculty requesting a nonmandatory review will be
expected to have a clear record of teaching, scholarship, and service that meets the
expectations for the rank being considered. Lack of the required documentation is
necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

2. 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.

3. 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 college. The
committee will confirm the status of an untenured faculty member seeking non-
mandatory tenure review with the dean.

4. A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the
Eligible Faculty, the dean, or any other party to the review to making a positive
recommendation during the review itself.

c. Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for
the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

1. **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.

2. **Early Autumn:** Review the DAPTSC written evaluation of each case following the Eligible Faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the dean.

   d. Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the dean in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full Eligible Faculty does not vote on these cases since the college’s recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on the college’s cases.

4. **Eligible Faculty Responsibilities**

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

   a. To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate’s dossier including submitted articles in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

   b. To engage fully in DAPTSC discussions and meetings.

   c. To attend all Eligible Faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one’s control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

   d. To complete the recommended training for faculty reviews, promotion, and tenure discussions every two years.

5. **Dean Responsibilities**

   The responsibilities of the dean are as follows:

   a. To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.

   b. To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the DAPTSC, the chair and the candidate. (Also see #7 External Evaluations below.)

   c. 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 college 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 college.

   d. To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment.

   e. To make each candidate’s dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Eligible Faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

   f. 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.

   g. To attend the meetings of the Eligible Faculty which promotion and tenure matters are discussed as
an observer to be informed by the faculty deliberation. Further, the dean will respond to questions asked of them during the meeting. Following the discussion, the dean will leave the meeting to allow for additional discussion among the Eligible Faculty members.

h. To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Eligible Faculty’s completed evaluation and recommendation.

i. To meet with the Eligible Faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

j. To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the college review process:

1. Of the recommendations by the Eligible Faculty and dean.

2. Of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Eligible Faculty and dean.

3. Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten (10) days from receipt of the letter from the dean, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the dean, indicating whether or not they expect to submit comments.

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

l. 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 dean’s independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

6. Procedures for Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI, part B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean’s recommendation is negative. Positive recommendations shall proceed to the executive vice president and provost.

7. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical/teaching or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship.

All external evaluators will receive the candidate’s CV, five papers published by the candidate since the time of hire or last review, and a description of the candidate’s position (e.g., scholarship, teaching, and service expectations).

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

a. Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate’s scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an “arms’ length” evaluation of the research record and 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 affiliation with a similarly or more highly ranked academic unit or institution. Letters of evaluation from non-peer institutions must be justified based on the evaluator’s pre-eminence in the field. This college will generally solicit evaluations from professors. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, less than half of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
b. 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 college 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 DAPTSC, dean, 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 college requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the dean, 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 college’s written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

VII. APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained 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

The college follows Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) which sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of the sixth year review.

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Every student in every course for which the minimum enrollment is met must be provided an opportunity to complete a confidential evaluation of the instruction and the instructor. The Student Evaluation of
Instruction (SEI) is the required method of obtaining student opinion. However, faculty may add other methods to obtain feedback about their teaching for their annual reviews. All faculty members must obtain students’ evaluations of their teaching using the SEI. Student evaluations should be presented in table format over time by semester. Trends and/or patterns of responses in evaluations are considered to be as important as or potentially more important than individual items or scores for any particular year.

Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if they are 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

Annually the dean or designee appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee (consisting of at least three tenured faculty and at least one non-probationary clinical/teaching faculty member). The Committee shall be responsible for gathering evidence of the quality and effectiveness of teaching, which at a minimum, includes two peer evaluations (ideally one before fourth-year review and one after the fourth-year review) during the probationary period and at least two for promotion from associate professor to professor.

The Peer Review of Teaching Committee term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the unit. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

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

a. To review the teaching of tenure-track and clinical/teaching faculty with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned (including online classes).

b. To review, upon the division 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 evaluating teaching.

c. 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 division chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review; faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

d. To identify additional peer teaching evaluators, train them, and provide them an assignment list for peer evaluations to conduct.

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations 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. 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 division chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate is encouraged to provide written reflection on this report, and the reviewer may respond if they wish. The reports are included in the candidate’s promotion and tenure dossier.