

**From:** [Oberyszyn, Tatiana](#)  
**To:** [Smith, Randy](#); [Reed, Katie](#)  
**Cc:** [Li, Lang](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Exception Request- Clinical Track cap  
**Date:** Friday, September 1, 2023 1:17:33 PM  
**Attachments:** [BMI Exception Request 8.29.23\[1\].pdf](#)

---

Dear Dr. Smith,

Attached please find an updated request from Dr. Lang Li, Chair of Biomedical Informatics for an exception request for the clinical track ratio cap. The college remains supportive of the request. Please let us know if you need any additional information. Dr. Lang will make himself available to attend the appropriate CAA meeting to answer questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,  
Tania

**Tania (Tatiana) Oberyszyn, PhD**  
Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs  
College of Medicine

Professor, Dept of Pathology  
230 Meiling Hall  
370 West 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
(614) 685-3584



---

**From:** "Oberyszyn, Tatiana" <Tatiana.Oberyszyn@osumc.edu>  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 17, 2023 at 10:24 AM  
**To:** "Reed, Katie (OSU)" <reed.901@osu.edu>, "Smith, Randy (OSU)" <smith.70@osu.edu>  
**Cc:** "Li, Lang" <Lang.Li@osumc.edu>, "Fernandez, Soledad" <Soledad.Fernandez@osumc.edu>  
**Subject:** FW: Exception Request- Clinical Track cap

Dear Dr. Smith,

Attached please find a request from Dr. Lang Li, Chair of Biomedical Informatics for an exception request for the clinical track ratio cap. Given the rapid growth of collaborative research demand in the College of Medicine, especially in the Department of Biomedical Informatics and Center for Biostatistics, the college is supportive of Dr. Lang's request. I would appreciate it if you would consider the request at an upcoming CAA meeting. Please let us know if you need any additional information. Dr. Lang will make himself available to attend the CAA meeting to answer questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,  
Tania

**Tania (Tatiana) Oberyszyn, PhD**  
Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs  
College of Medicine

Professor, Dept of Pathology  
230 Meiling Hall  
370 West 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
(614) 685-3584



---

**From:** "Li, Lang" <Lang.Li@osumc.edu>  
**Date:** Thursday, May 4, 2023 at 7:41 PM  
**To:** "Oberyszyn, Tatiana" <Tatiana.Oberyszyn@osumc.edu>  
**Cc:** "Kay, Kendra" <Kendra.Kay@osumc.edu>, "Norris, Ryan" <Ryan.Norris@osumc.edu>, "Fernandez, Soledad" <Soledad.Fernandez@osumc.edu>  
**Subject:** Exception Request- Clinical Track cap

Tania,

Given the rapid growth of collaborative research demand in the College of Medicine, especially in the Department of Biomedical Informatics and Center for Biostatistics, we would like to make an exception request for clinical track ratio cap. Right now, our clinical track faculty cannot keep up with the growing needs of collaborative research. Our letter of request is attached.

Best,

Lang Li, PhD  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Biomedical Informatics  
College of Medicine  
The Ohio State University



Lang Li, PhD,  
Professor and Chair

250 Lincoln Tower  
1800 Cannon Drive  
Columbus, OH 43210

614-292-4778 Phone  
614-688-6600 Fax

August 20, 2023

Re: Exception request on non-tenure track faculty cap.

Tatiana Oberyshyn, PhD  
Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs  
Director of the Center for Faculty Advancement, Mentoring and Engagement  
Jack C. Geer MD Endowed Chair of Pathology Professor of Pathology  
College of Medicine  
The Ohio State University  
370 West 9th Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210

Dean Oberyshyn,

Department of Biomedical Informatics (DBMI) has experienced significant growth during the past five years. We have grown from 16 faculty members in 2018 to 32 faculty members as of August 2023. Our faculty is currently comprised of 17 tenure track faculty members and 14 clinical track faculty members and 1 research track faculty member. We are planning to move this research track faculty member into clinical track faculty in the near future. In an effort to advance the capabilities of DBMI, improve academic excellence and operating efficiency of the department we are requesting an exemption from University Rule 3335-7-03: Appointment Cap "clinical/teaching/practice faculty may comprise no more than forty percent of the total tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty" The Department of Biomedical Informatics would like to increase our non-tenure track faculty cap to up to 75%.

Unfortunately, the current <40% cap is significantly limiting the growth of the department right now. Unlike any other basic science departments in the College of Medicine, DBMI has been and is becoming more and more essential for team science research, especially collaboration in data science in biomedical research, including biostatistics, population health, bioinformatics, computational biology, artificial intelligence, clinical informatics, and implementation science. The faculty are in high demand throughout the OSU Medical Center due to need to have quantitative/qualitative data science expertise in almost every research study. For example, we have an ongoing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Comprehensive Cancer Center (CCC), who will ask DBMI hire 3 clinical track faculty in Biostatistics and Population Health. We also have a similar MOU with the College of Medicine to hire 2 clinical track faculty members, again in Biostatistics and Population Health. In the meantime, we are in negotiation with CCC, to hire 3 new clinical track faculty in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology to be able to support CCC investigators with their bioinformatics needs. In the next three years, we will need to more clinical track faculty slots when developing collaborations with many clinical departments. For example, Nationwide Childrens Hospital (i.e. Department of Pediatrics) wants to hire 3 or more clinical track faculty who can collaborate and provide biostatistics and population health science support. . We will further develop an AI in Digital Health Collaboration Center. Similar to the Center for Biostatistics, this AI in Digital Health Collaboration Center will include largely clinical track faculty that can expand collaborations by providing AI and ML expertise to all biomedical research. We are planning to recruit 3 clinical track faculty into this center, in the near future. In total, DBMI projects to recruit at least 14 clinical track faculty dedicated to collaborative research.

DBMI is actively developing both undergraduate program and PhD program around AI in Biomedical Research. Once these programs are established, we are planning to recruit and enroll 1000 undergraduate



students and 40 PhD students in 6 years. In order to achieve these ambitious goals, we are looking forward to recruit 10 clinical track faculty dedicated to teaching.

DBMI faculty has done extensive discussion on the expansion of BMI faculty. There is a strong desire to increase the cap of non-tenure track faculty from <40% to a higher number. We conducted two rounds of votes about this matter. In the first round, tenure track faculty agreed to increase the cap from <40% to <75%. Among 17 eligible tenure track faculty, 12 voted "yes" and 3 voted "no". In the second round, DBMI faculty voted on changing <40% to <75% non-tenure track cap in the DBMI Pattern of Administration document. Among 32 eligible faculty, 20 voted "yes" and 3 voted "no". Therefore, DBMI's application to increase the cap in non-tenure track faculty is well supported by majority of DBMI faculty.

We are looking forward to your feedback on our application to increase the cap of non-tenure track faculty.

Sincerely,

Lang Li, Ph.D.  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Biomedical Informatics  
College of Medicine  
The Ohio State University

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure  
Criteria and Procedures for  
The Ohio State University  
Department of Biomedical  
Informatics (BMI)**

Approved by the BMI Faculty: 04/20/2021

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 08/03/2021

## Table of Contents

<b>I</b>	<b>Preamble</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>II</b>	<b>BMI Mission</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>III</b>	<b>Definitions</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	<b>A Committee of the Eligible Faculty</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	5
	2 Clinical Faculty .....	5
	3 Research Faculty .....	5
	4 Associated Faculty .....	6
	5 Conflict of Interest .....	6
	6 Minimum Composition .....	6
	<b>B Quorum</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	<b>C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	1 Appointment.....	7
	2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal .....	7
<b>IV</b>	<b>Appointments</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	<b>A Criteria</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	7
	2 Clinical Faculty .....	10
	3 Research Faculty .....	11
	4 Associated Faculty .....	12
	5 Emeritus Faculty .....	14
	6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	15
	<b>B Procedures</b> .....	<b>15</b>
	1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	15
	2 Clinical Faculty .....	16
	3 Research Faculty .....	17
	4 Transfer from the Tenure Track.....	17
	5 Associated Faculty .....	17
	6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	18
<b>V</b>	<b>Annual Performance and Merit Review</b> .....	<b>18</b>
	<b>A Documentation</b> .....	<b>18</b>
	<b>B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty</b> .....	<b>19</b>
	1 Fourth-Year Review .....	19
	2 Eighth Year Review .....	19
	3 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period.....	19
	<b>C Tenured Faculty</b> .....	<b>20</b>
	<b>D Clinical Faculty</b> .....	<b>20</b>
	<b>E Research Faculty</b> .....	<b>20</b>
	<b>F Associated Faculty</b> .....	<b>21</b>
	<b>G Salary Recommendations</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>VI</b>	<b>Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews</b> .....	<b>22</b>
	<b>A Criteria and Documentation</b> .....	<b>22</b>
	1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure .....	22
	2 Promotion to Professor .....	25
	3 Promotion of Clinical Faculty .....	27

4	Research Faculty .....	34
5	Associated Faculty .....	35
<b>B</b>	<b>Procedures for Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty .....</b>	<b>36</b>
1	Candidate Responsibilities .....	36
2	Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities .....	40
3	Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities .....	42
4	Department Chair Responsibilities .....	42
5	Procedures for Associated Faculty .....	43
6	External Evaluations .....	43
<b>VII</b>	<b>Appeals .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>VIII</b>	<b>Reviews in the final year of probabtion .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>IX</b>	<b>Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Student Evaluation of Teaching .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Glossary of Terms .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics .....</b>	<b>49</b>

## I Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the College of Medicine and University. The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to BMI and College of Medicine; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Should those rules and policies change, the department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the department chair.

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

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

*"Ohio State does not discriminate on the basis of age, ancestry, color, disability, gender, gender identity or expression, genetic information, HIV/AIDS status, military status, national origin, pregnancy, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or protected veteran status, or any other bases under the law, in its activities, academic programs, admission, and employment."*

## II BMI Mission

Biomedical informatics is a transdisciplinary field focused on turning data into knowledge that can advance our understanding of biology, biotechnology, clinical care, and health systems. The Department of biomedical informatics is committed to working as a team to shape the future of medicine by creating, disseminating and applying new knowledge, and by personalizing health care to meet the needs and preferences of each individual.

We share and endorse the values of the College of Medicine, including inclusiveness, determination, empathy, sincerity, ownership, and innovation. We operate on the premise that all faculty, staff, and students in the College have unique talents that contribute to the pursuit of excellence. In addition to professional accomplishments, collegiality, civility and mutual respect are strongly held values. We support that people can have diverse beliefs and encourage the free exchange of ideas and opinion and expects that faculty, staff, and students promote these values and apply them in a professional manner in all academic endeavors and in both our internal and external interactions.

All members of our department contribute our productivity, both through their personal accomplishments and by positively influencing the productivity of others. This synergism may be seen in the creation of our learning environment, research collaborations, co-authorship of publications, activities promoting health and wellness, and by sharing innovative ideas with the broader community. All members of our department should work toward establishing and maintaining a team culture and an enriching and diverse intellectual working and learning environment. We are committed to evaluating the practice of these core values as part of all performance evaluations.



### 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 BMI. The Department chair, the dean and assistant/associate/vice deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal. Senior rank faculty under consideration, regardless of category (tenure-track, clinical, research, associated), may be reviewed only by faculty of the rank at or above consideration (associate and professor for associate, and professor for professor).

#### 1 Tenure-track Faculty

##### Initial Appointment Reviews

For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate professor or professor), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must then be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

##### Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

#### 2 Clinical Faculty

##### Initial Appointment Reviews

For appointment (hiring) at senior rank (associate professor-clinical or professor-clinical), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track and all clinical faculty in the department. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must then be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

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

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

#### 3 Research Faculty

##### Initial Appointment Reviews

For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track and all research faculty in the department. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must then be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

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

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

## **4 Associated Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal**

The appointment, reappointment, and contract renewal of all compensated associated faculty are decided by Department chair following a vote of the eligible faculty. On initial appointment, eligible faculty are all tenure-track and clinical faculty.

The eligible faculty for new appointment reviews of associated faculty appointed at senior rank consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in BMI, all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in BMI, and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in BMI at or above the rank for which the candidate is being reviewed.

### **Promotion Reviews**

Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, clinical titles, and lecturer titles.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct and tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1 above.

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

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the Department chair in consultation with the eligible faculty.

## **5 Conflict of interest**

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

## **6 Minimum Composition**

In the event that BMI does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, Department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member (or multiple faculty members) from another tenure-initiating unit within the College.

## **B Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leaves of absence 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 Department chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

## **C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

### **1 Appointment**

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

### **2 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 two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. In the case of a joint appointment, BMI must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment BMI prior to their reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, or contract renewal.

## **IV Appointments**

### **A Criteria**

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

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

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

An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor has not met the expectations for moving from instructor to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment. Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. Unless there are unique circumstances, the college recommends against requesting prior service credit. This request must be approved by BMI's eligible faculty, the Department chair, the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs and if approved is irrevocable except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

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

- Anticipated receipt of an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Individuals who have completed all the requirements of their terminal degree, but who have not obtained the final degree at the time of initial employment will be appointed as an instructor. In addition, appointment at the rank of instructor is appropriate for individuals who, at the time that they join the faculty, do not have the requisite skills or experience to fully assume the full range of responsibilities of an assistant professor.
- Evidence of potential for excellence in scholarship. Such evidence might include peer-reviewed publications in a mentored setting, but insufficient evidence of an independent, creative, and productive program of research with potential for external funding.
- A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].
- In aggregate, accomplishments related to the above criteria should be sufficiently compelling that the appointee is judged to have significant potential to attain tenure and a distinguished record as a faculty member in BMI.

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

Consistent with Faculty Rule, [3335-6-09](#) faculty members without clinical service responsibilities are reviewed for promotion & tenure no later than the 6<sup>th</sup> year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> year. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7<sup>th</sup> year will be the final year of employment. Faculty members with significant clinical service responsibilities are granted an extended probationary period of up to 11 years, including prior service credit, depending on the pattern of research, teaching, and service workload. An assistant professor with an extended probationary period

is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the 11<sup>th</sup> year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> year. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 12<sup>th</sup> year will be the final year of employment.

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

Criteria for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor in the Tenure Track include:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.
- Early evidence of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by the initial development of a body of research, scholarship, and creative work. In addition, evidence must be provided that supports a candidate's potential for an independent program of scholarship and a strong likelihood of independent extramural research funding.
- A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].
- In aggregate, accomplishments related to the above criteria should be sufficiently compelling that the appointee is judged to have significant potential to attain tenure and a distinguished record as a faculty member in the College of Medicine.

**Associate Professor with Tenure on the Tenure Track.** Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Criteria for appointment to the rank of associate professor with tenure are identical to the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, as detailed in Section VI of this document. 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. In general, appointments at higher rank shall not entail a probationary period unless there are compelling reasons not to offer tenure.

**Associate Professor in Advance of Tenure on the Tenure Track.** While appointments to the rank of associate professor typically include tenure, a probationary period can be granted after petition to the Office of Academic Affairs. BMI must exercise care in making these appointments, and provide the metrics that the faculty member must achieve to be awarded tenure. For faculty without significant clinical service responsibilities the probationary period may not exceed four years. For faculty with significant clinical service responsibility, the probationary period may not exceed six years. Requests for such appointments require the approval of the Dean of the College of Medicine, and the Executive Vice President and Provost. An appointment to the rank of associate professor in advance of tenure is probationary. During a probationary period a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Criteria for appointment to the rank of associate professor in advance of tenure are identical to the criteria for promotion to associate professor in advance of tenure, as detailed in Section VI of this document. 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.

**Appointment: Professor with Tenure.** Appointment offers at the rank of professor require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Criteria for initial appointment to the rank of professor with tenure are identical to BMI’s and College of Medicine’s criteria for promotion to professor with tenure, as detailed in Section VI of this document. The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. The university will not grant tenure unless 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 Faculty

Clinical faculty are equivalent in importance to BMI as the Tenure Track faculty. The Clinical faculty exists in BMI for those faculty members whose principal career focus is outstanding teaching, clinical and translational research, and delivery of exemplary clinical service. Clinical faculty members will generally not have sufficient time to meet the scholarship requirements of the Tenure Track within a defined probationary period. For this reason, the nature of scholarship for the Clinical faculty differs from that in the Tenure Track and may be focused on a mixture of academic pursuits including the scholarship of applied methods in study design and data analysis, informatics platform development and implementation, practice, integration, community engagement and education, as well as new knowledge discovery. Faculty members appointed to the clinical faculty may choose to distinguish themselves in service for patient care, teaching, innovative educational program development, or team science research. Faculty members appointed to the clinical faculty may choose to distinguish themselves through several portfolios of responsibility including Clinician-Educator, Clinician-Scholar, or Clinical Excellence. The Clinician-Educator pathway may reflect excellence as an educator as measured by teaching evaluations and innovative teaching practices and curricula or modules development, and publications. The Clinician-Scholar pathway reflects excellence in basic science, biostatistics and biomedical informatics research, translational science, clinical research and/or health services research (e.g., secondary data analyses, clinical trial study design, biostatistics and bioinformatics data analysis, applied methodology to solve problems that arise in their collaborative studies, clinical informatics tool development and implementation, public health care policy, outcomes and comparative effectiveness research) as measured by publications and grant funding, respectively. The Clinical Excellence pathway exists for faculty members who focus on exemplary service for practice within their field. Faculty members on this pathway typically devote 80% or more of their effort to practice within their defined field. Faculty members on the Clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters of tenure track faculty.

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

The initial contract for all clinical faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract at all ranks is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. A faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year if he or she will be reappointed for another year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of the contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years.

**Appointment: Assistant Professor on the Clinical faculty.** Candidates for appointment at this rank are expected to have completed all relevant training, including graduate studies, consistent with the existing or proposed educational program goals of BMI. The initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary. During a probationary period a faculty member is considered for reappointment annually. A probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the provision of University Rule 3335-6-08 and the provision of paragraphs (B) and (D) of University Rule 3335-7-07. An assistant professor may be reviewed for promotion at any time during the probationary period or during a subsequent contract.

This is the appropriate level for initial appointment of persons holding the appropriate terminal degree and the relevant experience/expertise. Candidates for appointment to the rank of assistant professor on the clinical faculty will have, at a minimum:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.
- Evidence of contributions to scholarship and education, and the potential to advance through the faculty ranks.
- A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].

**Appointment: Associate Professor on the Clinical faculty.** The criteria for initial appointment at the rank of associate professor to the clinical faculty, are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VI of this document.

**Appointment: Professor on the Clinical faculty.** The criteria for initial appointment at the rank of professor in the clinical faculty, are identical to those criteria for promotion to this rank as outlined in Section VI of this document.

### **3 Research Faculty**

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

Research faculty are made in accordance with Chapter 7 of the *Rules of the University Faculty 3335-7*. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of BMI. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the Tenure Track faculty in a BMI, Research faculty must comprise no more than twenty per cent of the number of Tenure Track faculty in BMI. In all cases, however, the number of Research faculty positions in a unit must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in BMI.

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

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

**Assistant Professor on the Research faculty.** The candidate for appointment as a research assistant professor must have at a minimum:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or possession of equivalent experience.
- Completion of sufficient research training to provide the basis for specific expertise for contributing to the research mission.
- An initial record of scholarship that indicates effective collaboration and contribution to peer-reviewed research, reflected by co-authorship of peer-reviewed publications or funded effort on peer-reviewed grants.
- A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors [see Appendix B].
- Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

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

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

#### **4 Associated Faculty**

Associated Faculty, as defined in the *Rules of the University Faculty 3335-5-19* (B)(3), include



“persons with practice titles, adjunct titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles.” Persons with a tenure-track faculty title on an appointment of less than 50% FTE are associated faculty. Members of the associated faculty are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. Associated faculty appointments are for one to three years. The below titles are used for associated faculty in the College of Medicine.

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

**Instructor - Practice, Assistant Professor - Practice, Associate Professor - Practice, Professor - Practice.** Practice associated faculty appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Uncompensated appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated academic service to a BMI, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Compensated appointments are given to full time clinicians who are not appointed to the clinical or tenure track faculty.

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

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

**Lecturer.** Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master’s degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to Senior lecturer if they meet the requirements for appointment at that rank.

**Senior Lecturer.** Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master’s degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

**Tenure track Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.** Individuals on the tenure track with an appointment at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated fall within the associated faculty. Associated tenure track is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Associated tenure track faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.

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

At a minimum, all candidates for Associated faculty appointments must meet the following criteria:

- Associated clinical faculty with clinical responsibilities must be a licensed physician or health care provider if required for successful execution of their faculty responsibilities.
- Have significant and meaningful interaction in at least one of the following mission areas of the College of Medicine:
- Teaching of students in biomedical informatics training programs, and/or medical students, residents, clinical fellows, undergraduate and graduate students.
- Research: These faculty members may collaborate with Department of Biomedical Informatics.
- Service to Department of Biomedical Informatics: This includes participation in committees.

**Associated Faculty at Advanced Rank.** Associated faculty may be compensated or uncompensated, and typically provide service to BMI in the areas of research or education. For compensated faculty who contribute principally through educational activities or scholarship, the appointment at advanced rank criteria and procedures will be identical to those for the clinician-educator pathway or scholar pathway.

## 5 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured and nonprobationary clinical associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department chair. The Department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered. See the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available. Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

## **6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

A non-salaried appointment for a University faculty member from another department is considered a Courtesy appointment. An individual with an appointment in one department may request a Courtesy appointment in another department when that faculty member's scholarly and academic activity overlaps significantly with the discipline represented by the second unit. Such appointments must be made in the same faculty rank/track, using the same title, as that offered in the primary department. Courtesy appointments are warranted only if they are accompanied by substantial involvement in the academic and scholarly work of the department.

## **B Procedures**

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

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

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

- The dean or designee of the college provides approval for BMI to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.
- The Department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within BMI.
- 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.

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university job postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to Department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. The university may only award tenure to faculty members who are: (1) U.S. citizens or nationals; (2) permanent residents (“green card” holders); (3) asylees or refugees; or (4) individuals otherwise described as “protected individuals” pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b).
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the BMI office. If the faculty does not agree, the Department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

Virtual and on-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the Department chair; and the Dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship, 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.

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

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

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

The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. The university will not grant tenure unless an individual is a (1) U.S. citizen or national; (2) permanent resident (“green card” holder); (3) asylee or refugee; or (4) an individual otherwise described as a “protected individual” pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b). The TIU will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in seeking residency status for the appointee promptly and diligently.

## **2 Clinical Faculty**

Searches for initial appointments in the Clinical faculty should follow the same procedures as those utilized by BMI and the College of Medicine for Tenure Track faculty, with the exception that the candidate is not required to give a presentation. A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all clinical faculty positions. Exceptions to this policy must be requested in advance from the Dean of the College of Medicine.

### **3 Research Faculty**

Searches for initial appointments in the Research faculty should follow the same procedures as those utilized by BMI and the College of Medicine for Tenure Track faculty, with the exception that the candidate is not required to make a presentation.

### **4 Transfer from the Tenure Track**

Transfers between faculty categories are permitted only under the strict guidelines detailed in the paragraphs below, per University Rules [3335-7-09](#) and [3335-7-10](#). Furthermore, transfer of an individual to a category with more limited expectations for scholarship may not be used as mechanism for retaining underperforming faculty members. An engaged, committed, productive and diverse faculty should be the ultimate goal of all appointments.

#### **Transfer: Tenure Track to Clinical faculty**

If faculty members' activities become more aligned with the criteria for appointment to the Clinical faculty, they may request a transfer. A transfer request must be approved by the Department chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. The first appointment to the new clinical faculty position is probationary; and tenure, or the possibility thereof, is revoked. The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities. Presumably, these will differ from prior expectations.

#### **Transfer: Tenure Track to Research Faculty**

If faculty members wish to engage exclusively in research, without the multiple demands required of the tenure track, they may request a transfer. A transfer request must be approved by the Department chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. The first appointment to the new research faculty position is probationary; and tenure, or the possibility thereof, is revoked. The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities. Presumably, these will differ from prior expectations.

#### **Transfer: Clinical or Research to Tenure Track**

Transfer from the Clinical faculty or Research faculty to the Tenure Track is not permitted, but Clinical and Research faculty are eligible to apply for Tenure Track positions through a competitive national search. The new letter of offer must outline a new set of expectations for the faculty member aligned with the new responsibilities. Presumably, these will differ from prior expectations.

### **5 Associated Faculty**

The appointment, reappointment, and contract renewal of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the Department chair following a vote of the eligible faculty. Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in BMI and are decided by the Department chair in consultation with the eligible 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 BMI'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 Appointments for Faculty**

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

## **V Annual Performance and Merit Review**

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

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

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

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

### **A Documentation**

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department chair by the date requested:

- 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 that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document.

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

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

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

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

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

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

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the Department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. The objective of this review will be to determine if adequate progress towards the achievement of promotion and tenure is being made by the candidate. The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by secret ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

### **2 Eighth Year Review**

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

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

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



### **C Tenured Faculty**

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

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to BMI, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

### **D Clinical Faculty**

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

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

For probationary faculty, if the position will continue, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. This review involves the solicitation of an updated CV and a vote by the committee of eligible faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

### **E Research Faculty**

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

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the Department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.



## **F Associated Faculty**

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

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment (or hired annually for multiple years) are reviewed annually by the Department chair, or designee, who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The Department chair will decide whether or not to reappoint, and their recommendation on reappointment is final.

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

## **G Salary Recommendations**

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

In formulating recommendations, the Department chair consults with the department's Vice chairs. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

Except when the university dictates any type of across the board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable by BMI.

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 24 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance and a pattern of consistent professional growth will be viewed positively. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more core areas as defined by the Department chair are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

## **VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the context for promotion and tenure and promotion review. Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. It is recognized that these positive attributes characterize the ability of a faculty member to effectively contribute to exemplary scholarship, teaching and service. A commitment to these values and principles can be demonstrated by constructive responses to and participation in University and College of Medicine initiatives. Examples include participation in faculty governance, outreach and service, ethical behavior, adherence to principles of responsible conduct of research, constructive conduct and behavior during the discharge of duties, responsibilities and authority, and the exercise of rights and privileges of a member of the faculty as reflected in the "[Statement on Professional Ethics](#)" of the American Association of University Professors [Appendix B].

### **A Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion**

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

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The awarding of tenure is an acknowledgment of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It requires evidence of consistent achievement throughout the professional life of the faculty member. Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure occurs when a faculty member exhibits convincing evidence of excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated by a national level of impact and recognition of scholarship. In addition, excellence in teaching and service is required, but alone is not sufficient for promotion and awarding of tenure. These three key areas of achievement: scholarship, teaching and service, are individually discussed below.

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

Scholarship: Demonstration of national recognition and impact for a thematic independent program of scholarship is an essential requirement for promotion to associate professor and the award of tenure. Candidates must also demonstrate the impact of the scholarship, not just the potential for impact. Independence must be reflected in the record of scholarship. Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery, development, and dissemination of new knowledge and/or methods. Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by: i. a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings or reflected in entrepreneurship (patents/intellectual property); ii. sustained obtainment of extramural funding; and iii. the achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact within their field of endeavor.

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion and tenure decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements since appointment to the tenure track at The Ohio State University. Evidence of scholarship below the specified range does not preclude a positive promotion decision especially if reasonable extenuating circumstances exist. Furthermore, scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive tenure or promotion decision, especially if it occurs in isolation or in the context of poor performance in other areas such as evidence of teaching excellence.

Faculty may be involved in a range of scholarly activities that can include individual contributions, developing a lab, leading a core, and/or being engaged in team science. As

long as a faculty can document their own contributions to scholarship and their impact, the department does not favor one career path over another nor does it view the paths as mutually exclusive or fixed for the duration of the candidates career.

### **Publications**

A sustained record of scholarly productivity, reflected by both quality and quantity, as an assistant professor is required for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Candidates should ideally have 15-25 relevant peer-reviewed publications since their appointment as an assistant professor. The candidate must demonstrate that they play a critical and essential role in driving the research forward in a substantial number of these publications (see below for definition). The pattern of scholarship should display an increasing propensity for the faculty to be one of the authors driving the research. For faculty who pursue independent research, these substantial number of publications are first, senior, or corresponding authors, and at least two such publications (first, senior, or corresponding author) should appear in journals with impact factor higher than 4, or impact factors that rank among the top five in their field. Alternative authorship positions may be important for some fields. Candidates should document other important positions within their dossier and provide an explanation of the importance.

Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued. In cases where a faculty member's collaborative scholarship results in middle authorship, the recognition and impact of their scholarship will be reflected through other indicators such as, but not limited to, the indispensability of the candidate's role and contribution in generating the publication. As with any publication with multiple authors, a narrative description of the candidate's intellectual contribution can be used to highlight the importance of contribution for instances of middle authorship. Therefore, when pursuing team science research, the faculty candidate must demonstrate the significant role in a substantial number of multi-authored publications, and some of these publications are first, senior or corresponding authors. At least two such publications should appear in journals with impact factor higher than 4, or impact factors that rank among the top five in their field.

The quantity and quality of publications should be considered. Metrics that are useful in assessing a candidate's record of scholarship include but are not limited to the total number of publications since their appointment as an assistant professor, the number of citations of their publications, the trajectory of the publication and/or citation record, and the relative proportion of significant authorship positions (e.g., first, senior, corresponding, or leading contributor in quantitative science). Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%), and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles or conference proceedings (especially in fields such as computer science where they are the norm); book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion.

The impact factor of a journal may or may not reflect the quality of the scholarship. The best journal in some areas of research may have a relatively low impact factor but may be highly respected or highly cited by peers in that area. Top ranked journals and their impact factors are not the same across these disciplines. Conversely, publication in journals with a very high impact factor may reflect broad interest, but does not in and of itself demonstrate the impact of research. Impact may be demonstrated through non-traditional metrics. This can include but is not limited to social media penetration, blog subscription, Altmetrics score, non-academic invited presentations, collaborations that advance the mission of the university or the field, and interviews by reputable national media outlets on scholarly topics.

In summary, demonstration of impact and a national reputation of an independent program of research is a prerequisite for promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure.

### **Externally funded research**

Evidence of sustained or multiple external peer reviewed grant support is a crucial indicator of expertise in the field. Given the multidisciplinary nature of biomedical informatics, there are opportunities to lead independent projects and/or to provide leadership within multidisciplinary externally-supported studies. The Department looks for candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure to demonstrate leadership and independence as either the Principal Investigator (PI) or a Multiple Principal Investigator (MPI) in a R01, P01, U54, or K award. Funding expectation may also be met by both NIH and non-NIH sources (including but not limited to NSF, DoD, USDA, AHRQ, DARPA, RWJF, Commonwealth Fund, or Kaiser Family Foundation). For a faculty candidate who conducts team science research, the leadership and independence is demonstrated as a primary leader (e.g., Core Director ) in a large team-based research project, such as P01, P50, U54 or other comparable funding. They should ideally have demonstrated sustainability of their research program by renewal of the award and/or by garnering a second distinct nationally competitive, peer reviewed grant.

### **Entrepreneurship**

Evidence of entrepreneurship can contribute to the total body of scholarship, but is not required of all faculty. Entrepreneurship includes patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, materials transfers, technology commercialization, formation of startup companies, and licensing and option agreements. In as much as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, these will be analyzed flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract, patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenue should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly activities in the promotion and tenure dossier. Quantifying the impact of published informatics or statistical software can be challenging, but several metrics are available. If accompanied by a publication, the best measure is typically the number of times the publication has been cited. However, software is often used without being cited, so other indicators of impact should be taken into consideration. In particular, the number of times the software has been downloaded and the frequency with which the software is listed as a dependency by other packages are useful albeit imperfect measures (e.g., Depends/Imports/Suggests, for CRAN packages). Likewise, other distribution platforms often provide measures of software impact (e.g., "stars" on GitHub).

### **Teaching and Mentoring**

A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion and tenure. The teaching effort must be demonstrated as either serving as a course director or a new course development. The teaching performance may be demonstrated by positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and/or national peers. The dossier must clearly document the faculty member's contribution and the impact of these efforts. Teaching awards and other honors are also highly supportive of teaching excellence. Teaching effectiveness may also be reflected by documented impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities such as web-based design, mobile application, virtual teaching, or methods of evaluating teaching, program or course development, publications on teaching, and societal leadership in education. Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and hands-on training are

valued. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued.

### **Service**

Candidates must demonstrated effective service at the departmental and collegiate level. Service includes administrative service to OSU, excellent patient care, clinical program development, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Evidence of service within the institution can include but is not limited to appointment or election to BMI, College of Medicine, hospital, and/or University committees or working groups, or leadership of programs. Evidence of service to the faculty member's discipline or public and private entities beyond the University can include, but is not limited to ad hoc journal reviews, editorial boards or editorships; grant reviewer for national funding agencies; elected or appointed offices held and other service to local and national professional societies; service on panels and commissions; and professional consultation to industry, government, education and non-profit organizations.

Similarly, innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community, or design and implementation of a novel program to reduce race or gender based discrimination in the within BMI, College, University or beyond, can be considered service activities. Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

## **2 Promotion to Professor**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) establishes the general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor. The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

Awarding promotion to the rank of professor with tenure must be based upon convincing, unequivocal evidence that the candidate has a sustained eminence in their field with a record of achievement recognized by national leadership and/or international recognition and impact. The general criteria for promotion in scholarship, teaching and service require more advanced and sustained quantity, quality and impact than that required for promotion to associate professor. Importantly, the standard for external national/international reputation is substantially more rigorous than for promotion to Associate professor with tenure. This record of excellence must be evident from activities undertaken and accomplishments achieved since being appointed or promoted to the rank of associate professor. It is expected that the faculty member will have a consistent record of high-quality publications with demonstrated impact well beyond that required for promotion to associate professor.

A sustained record of external funding and an enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an associate professor is required for promotion to professor. Candidates for promotion to professor should ideally have an additional 20-30 peer-reviewed publications or proceedings since their promotion to associate professor. The candidate must demonstrate that they play a critical and essential role in driving the research forward in a substantial number of these publications. For faculty who pursue independent research, these substantial number of publications are first, senior, or corresponding authors. When pursuing team science research, the faculty candidate must demonstrate the significant role in substantial number of

multi-authored publications; and some of these publications are first, senior or corresponding authors.

Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and current peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program including sustained level of funding. At a minimum, faculty candidates who pursue independent research, the promotion to professor must be demonstrated with a PI or multiple-PD/PI on at least one NIH funded R01 or equivalent grant (e.g. but not limited to NSF, DoD, USDA, AHRQ, DARPA, RWJF, Commonwealth Fund, or Kaiser Family Foundation) with a history of at least one competitive renewal, or another nationally competitive grant, or have simultaneous funding on two NIH R01 level awards. This may include support from prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., American Heart Association, American Lung Association, American Diabetes Association, American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, the March of Dimes), a major industry grant, or other federal entities such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Defense and the National Science Foundation.

Faculty candidates, who pursue team science research, the leadership and independence is demonstrated as a primary leader (e.g., Core Director) in a large team-based research project, such as P01, P50, U54 or other comparable funding, with a history of at least one competitive renewal, or another nationally competitive grant, or have simultaneous funding on two multi-year program project grants or large scale multi-institutional grants. Funding requirements may also be met by a combination of individual and team-science awards.

Examples of evidence of national leadership or an international reputation include but are not limited to election or appointment to a leadership position of national or international societies, service as a national committee or task force chair, chair of an NIH or other federal review panel, regular membership on an NIH study section, peer recognition or awards for research, editorial boards or editorships of scientific journals, and invited lectures at hospitals or universities outside the country or at meetings of international societies.

### **Teaching and Mentoring**

A continued strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion. The teaching effort must be demonstrated as either serving as a course director or a new course development. Evidence may include, but is not limited to outstanding student, resident, fellow, local colleagues, and/or national peer evaluations, course or workshop leadership and design, a training program directorship, teaching awards, and organization of national course and curricula and participation in specialty boards or Residency Review Committees of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K- awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued. Candidates with clinical duties should demonstrate consistent and effective teaching of trainees and practicing clinicians, and leadership in the administration of clinical training programs.

Mentorship of junior faculty is expected for promotion to professor. It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just ad hoc career coaching. Candidates should provide evidence of the impact of their mentorship.

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.

## **Service**

Promotion to the rank of professor requires service to the COM, OSU, and in national and international professional societies. Service can include but is not limited to leadership roles on OSU committees, professional organizations and journal editorships. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise could include roles as a board examiner, service on panels and commissions, program development, and professional consultation to industry, government, and education. Similarly, innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community, or design and implementation of a novel program to reduce race or gender based discrimination in the within BMI, College, University or beyond, can be considered service activities.

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 the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of BMI, college and university.

### **3 Promotion of Clinical Faculty**

Clinical faculty members are not eligible for tenure. The criteria in the categories of teaching and service are, for the most part, similar to those for the Tenure Track for each faculty rank, although there is greater emphasis on teaching and service for clinical faculty, and less emphasis on traditional scholarship.

Clinical Faculty members may continue their service to BMI and the University without ever seeking promotion to the next higher faculty rank, simply through repeated reappointment at the same level. However, the goals and objectives of the College and the University are best served when all faculty members, strive for continued improvement in all academic areas as measured by meeting or exceeding the requirements for promotion to the next faculty rank.

The awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor to the clinical faculty must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor. Clinical faculty members typically pursue careers as clinician scholars, clinician educators, or clinical excellence.

#### **a Associate Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway**

The awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor on the clinical faculty – clinician-educator pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition as an educator since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of national recognition and impact should be related to biomedical informatics education but can also be related to scholarship, or professional service. Excellence is not required in all domains. The clinician-educator pathway may reflect effectiveness as an educator of trainees at any level.

### **Teaching and Mentoring**

A strong and consistent record of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion. The teaching effort must be demonstrated as either serving as course directors and new course development. Effectiveness may be measured by various metrics including, but not limited to curriculum/web-based design and implementation, innovative teaching practices, modules, and publications. Consistently positive teaching evaluations by students, trainees, and peers are required. Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section). Effectiveness may also be reflected by teaching awards or other honors. Clinician Educators may also demonstrate national impact through invitations to serve as faculty on societal leadership in education or other national activities. In all cases, evidence of improved educational processes or outcomes (i.e., impact) is required. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued.

### **Service**

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, exemplary patient care, program development relating to clinical, administrative, leadership and related activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Professional service could include, but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, service on editorial boards, service to the community as pertains to the candidate's specialty, development of innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community, or design and implementation of a novel program to reduce race or gender based discrimination within BMI, College, University or beyond, and leadership positions in professional societies.

### **Scholarship**

The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed journal publications. Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their scholarship. Faculty in the Clinician Educator Pathway may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain. Examples include papers regarding innovative teaching techniques, scholarly review articles and book chapters focused on education theory, new curricula and methods of evaluation. Alternatively, other faculty members in the Clinician Educator Pathway may publish work based on their areas of expertise which forms the basis for their teaching of colleagues and peers. These may include, but are not limited to review papers, book chapters as well as original investigator-initiated studies related to their area of clinical practice. Some faculty members may combine these two areas of career emphasis. For both types of faculty careers, development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are considered to be published works. In the current era of team and collaborative scholarship, it is recognized that meaningful scholarship is not uniformly represented by first or senior authorship. Work in which the faculty member's individual and identifiable expertise was essential to the publication are regarded as having merit equivalent to those that are first or senior author. A range of 5-10 scholarly written or digital publications of this type since appointment as an assistant professor is suggested as a scope of work consistent with promotion to associate professor. However, this range does not represent an inflexible requirement for promotion.

#### **b Professor, Clinician Educator Pathway**

The awarding of promotion to the rank of professor on the clinical faculty – clinician-educator pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that that the candidate has



developed a national level of leadership or international recognition since appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor. Evidence of international recognition or national leadership should be related to the primary focus of the pathway (didactic education), but can also be related to clinical, scholarship activities, or professional service. Excellence is not required in all domains.

### **Teaching and Mentoring**

A documented record of sustained teaching and mentoring excellence is required for promotion. **Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their teaching and mentoring.** The teaching effort must be demonstrated as either serving as course directors and new course development. Sustained positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and/or national peers are required. Multiple teaching awards and other honors are indicative of this level of teaching excellence but are not required. Candidates must demonstrate favorable impact on teaching and training programs, such as curriculum/web-based innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, and/or program or course development. Other examples include the development of multiple impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching, research and patient care. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued. Teaching excellence may also be demonstrated through committee appointments in national education committees such as Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, National Medical Association, American Association of Higher Education, Association of American Colleges and Universities or Association of American Medical Colleges. This also includes committee appointments or leadership positions in professional societies at the national level, such as the American Medical Informatics Association's Academic Forum

Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered to the rank of professor. Candidates should demonstrate evidence of mentoring or other career development activities for other faculty members.

### **Service**

Service to the institution and profession is an expectation for promotion to professor. Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, patient care, program development relating to clinical, administrative, leadership and related activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Professional service could include, but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, service on editorial boards, development of innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as creation and sustenance of a program to deliver healthcare to the community, or design and implementation of a novel program to reduce race or gender based discrimination within BMI, College, University or beyond, and leadership positions in professional societies. In addition, invitations to serve as external evaluators for promotion candidates from peer institutions is a reflection of national reputation.

### **Scholarship**

The candidate must demonstrate contributions to scholarship, a portion of which should be peer-reviewed journal publications. Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their scholarship. Faculty in the Clinician Educator Pathway may focus on the pedagogy of education and publish in this domain. Examples include papers regarding innovative teaching techniques, scholarly review articles and book chapters focused on education theory, new curricula and methods of evaluation or clinical community based educational

efforts. Alternatively, other faculty members in the Clinician Educator Pathway may publish work based on their areas of clinical expertise which form the basis for their teaching of colleagues and peers. These may include, but are not limited to, review papers, book chapters as well as original investigator-initiated studies related to their area of clinical or applied methods practice. Some faculty members may combine these two areas of career emphasis. Development of web-based or video-teaching modules and other digital media are considered to be published works. In the current era of team and collaborative scholarship, it is recognized that meaningful scholarship is not uniformly represented by first or senior authorship. Works in which the faculty member's individual and identifiable expertise was essential to the publication are regarded as having merit equivalent to those that are first or senior author. A range of 10-15 scholarly written or digital publications of this type since appointment or promotion to associate professor is suggested as a scope of work consistent with promotion to professor. However, this range does not represent an inflexible requirement for promotion.

**c Associate Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway**

The awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor on the clinical faculty - clinician-scholar pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that that the candidate has developed a national level of impact and recognition as a clinical scholar since being appointed to the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of national recognition and impact should be related to the primary focus of this pathway (scholarship). This recognition can also be related to clinical/practice, educational, or professional service, but is not required in these other domains.

**Teaching and Mentoring**

Consistent evidence of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion. This may be demonstrated by positive evaluations from students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and/or national peers. Teaching evaluations may be based on presentations internally or at other academic institutions, presentations or tutorials at scientific conferences or meetings, presentations at other medical centers or hospitals, etc. Teaching awards and other honors are also supportive of a strong teaching record, but are not required. Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members.

**Scholarship**

Demonstration of impact and a national reputation for scholarship is a prerequisite for promotion to associate professor. The dossier will require the demonstration of impact, not just the potential for impact. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued on the clinician-scholar pathway. The candidate is encouraged to focus interdisciplinary efforts in a small number of areas to gain a deeper understanding of the underlying science, which should improve the quality and relevance of the research contributions. Relevant interdisciplinary contributions such as determining most appropriate analytical techniques to use in designing a study and in modeling data are scientific research activities that require leadership, expertise, and innovation. The candidate must demonstrate scholarship typically as reflected primarily by an essential role in peer-reviewed published manuscripts but could also include study protocols, training manuals, manuals of operating procedures, scholarly review articles and case reports. While first and senior author papers are considered highly, other authorship positions (e.g., second, third, second to last) supportive of leadership and major contributions in collaborative research are also highly valued. However, because interdisciplinary publications often feature a large number of authors, the candidate that played a crucial role in the research may appear virtually anywhere in the author list. While

contributions to papers and projects will vary, the candidate should clearly articulate and provide supportive evidence demonstrating the independence of the research contributions, and the impact of those contributions to the interdisciplinary research. Evidence from other domains that demonstrate the faculty member's unique expertise at the national level (e.g. invitations to speak at national meetings, etc) are important in this regard. In general, a range of 20-35 peer reviewed publications since appointment to assistant professor is expected. Although review articles may provide supportive evidence of a faculty member's expertise in a field and form a portion of the publication list (typically less than 30%), a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles. Book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion.

Faculty on this pathway are expected to have acquired external funding (as PI, MPI, Co-I, or key scientific role e.g. as biostatistician, bioinformatician, or informatician) in support of their program of scholarship. The candidate should have a record of support as the lead personnel in their focus area (e.g., biostatistics, bioinformatics, informatics) on multiple externally and/or internally funded grants, programs, contracts, and/or projects. The impact of the role that the faculty has on these studies should be clearly demonstrated, taking into consideration both the quality and quantity of the candidate's contributions. High quality contributions to grant proposals are also important for a highly collaborative team scientist. In such cases, evidence provided by positive feedback from study section reviewers and supporting letters from collaborators can attest to the quality of the contribution. Alternatively, entrepreneurship and inventorship are also evidence of scholarly activity.

#### **Service**

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, program development relating to clinical, administrative, leadership and related activities, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Professional service could include, but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, serve on editorial boards, development of innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, and leadership positions in professional societies.

#### **d Professor, Clinician Scholar Pathway**

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

#### **Teaching and Mentoring**

Consistent and sustained evidence of effective teaching and mentoring is required for promotion to professor. Programs that improve the cultural competence of or access to teaching for underserved populations are particularly valued. This may be demonstrated by positive evaluations by students, residents, fellows, local colleagues and national peers. Teaching evaluations may be based on presentations internally or at other academic institutions, presentations or tutorials at scientific conferences or meetings, presentations at other medical centers or hospitals, etc. Teaching awards and other honors are also supportive of a strong teaching record but are not required. Peer evaluation is required on a

recurring basis for all faculty members (see dossier documentation section). Candidates should demonstrate consistent effective teaching of trainees, researchers, and/or practitioners.

Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered to the rank of professor. It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just ad hoc career coaching. Candidates must demonstrate evidence of mentoring or other career development activities for other faculty members. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards and other such mentored programs is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

### **Scholarship**

Demonstration of a sustained and expanded impact and national reputation for scholarship is a prerequisite for promotion to professor. The dossier will require the demonstration of impact, not just the potential for impact. The candidate must demonstrate scholarship and a clear track record of leadership in collaborative health science. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued. For team scientists, independence and key scientific contributions are typically demonstrated by establishment of interdisciplinary efforts in a focus area of basic, clinical or translational science. First and senior author papers are considered highly, but other authorship positions (e.g. second, third, second to last) on collaborative papers are often reflective of substantial research contributions where the candidate played an essential role in designing the study, linking and manipulating data sources, analyzing the data, disseminating study results. In disciplines where the last author is reserved for the senior author, this role often reflects expertise and leadership in conceptualizing and guiding the study. However, because interdisciplinary publications often feature a large number of authors, the candidate that played a crucial role in supporting the research may appear virtually anywhere in the author list. While authorship positions and contributions will vary, candidates should clearly articulate and demonstrate their independent research contributions and the impact of those contributions. Evidence from other domains that demonstrate the faculty member's unique expertise at the national and/or international level (e.g., invitations to serve on study sections, invitations to speak at national meetings, etc.) are critical in this regard. In general, a range of 25-40 peer reviewed publications since appointment to associate professor is expected. Although review articles may form a portion of the publication list and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field, a successful dossier will contain primarily peer-reviewed research articles. Books, book chapters, and reviews are valued, but alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion.

Faculty on this pathway are expected to have acquired external funding (as PI, MPI, Co-I, or key scientific leadership role) in support of their program of scholarship. The candidate should have a record of support as the lead personnel in their focus area (e.g., biostatistics, bioinformatics, informatics) on a substantial number of externally and/or internally funded grants, programs, contracts, and/or projects. The impact of the role that the faculty has on these studies should be clearly demonstrated, taking into consideration both the quality and quantity of the candidate's contributions. High quality contributions to grant proposals are also important for a highly collaborative team scientist. In such cases, evidence provided by positive feedback from study section reviewers and supporting letters from collaborators can attest to the quality of the contribution. Entrepreneurship and inventorship are also considered evidence of scholarly activity.

## **Service**

Promotion to the rank of professor requires service to the University, and in a national context. The faculty member should have increased levels of responsibility and leadership (e.g. committee chair or elected office in national or international organizations) since appointment or promotion to associate professor. Candidates may have led the development of new and innovative programs which received national recognition. Similarly, innovative programs that advance the mission of the university, such as the design and implementation of a novel program to reduce race or gender based discrimination within BMI, College, University or beyond, can be considered service activities. Professional service could include, but is not limited to, peer reviews of manuscripts and grant applications, service on editorial boards, and leadership positions in professional societies.

### **e Associate Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway**

Faculty members with predominantly clinical or practice-based responsibilities (i.e., application of informatics methodology, biostatistics, or health services research) may be considered for promotion based on clinical excellence or excellence in practice. Ordinarily these faculty have 80% or greater clinical or practice based responsibilities. These faculty have distinguished themselves by having particularly outstanding impact of their informatics, statistical, or health services research work. These faculty are recognized for the scholarship of practice or novel contributions to the advancement of the practice in their field. Local recognition for outstanding service to the institution is a hallmark of qualification for Associate Professor on the excellence pathway. National recognition is not a requirement.

The awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor on the excellence pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has demonstrated outstanding quality of work, and a record of impact relating to application of informatics methodology. Promotion will not be granted purely on the basis of length of service to the institution, productivity, or satisfactory job performance. A faculty member who qualifies for promotion this pathway should have supportive annual evaluations that document clinical effort in the years leading up to promotion on this pathway.

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

Examples of excellence may include, but are not limited to:

- Evidence of excellence in applied work and/or process improvement.
- Evidence of unique collaborations on projects due to unique expertise.
- Evidence that the candidate has successfully trained other in their area of expertise.
- Evidence on innovation within their field, including the development of new programs or invitations to present on or demonstrate their work to other institutions.
- Receipt of awards or commendations from local, state, national organizations for their contributions.
- Participation in the development of internal or external policies and procedures.
- Evidence that a faculty member has developed methodological innovations that have been adopted by other faculty within the Medical Center.

- Create and implement clinical outcome tracking documentation tools for health and wellness program for clinical care service and/or insurance programs.
- Innovation and/or application of informatics and analytics methodologies to support the business needs, decisions and service expansions of the institution.

**f Professor, Clinical Excellence Pathway**

Faculty members with predominantly clinical or practice-based responsibilities (i.e., application of informatics methodology, biostatistics, or health services research) may be considered for promotion based on their practice. Ordinarily these faculty have 80% or greater clinical, practice, and/or administrative responsibilities. These faculty have distinguished themselves by having particularly outstanding impact of their informatics work. The awarding of promotion to the rank of professor in the excellence pathway must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has demonstrated a sustained and enhanced level of excellence in methodology application and has developed a national impact and recognition since being appointed to the rank of associate professor. Mentorship of junior faculty is an expectation for faculty being considered to the rank of professor.

Promotion will not be granted solely on the basis of length of service to the institution, time in rank, clinical productivity, or satisfactory job performance. A faculty member who qualifies for promotion on this pathway should have supportive annual evaluations that document increasing clinical impact and performance since achieving the rank of associate professor. These faculty are expected to support the research and teaching mission of BMI, but the focus of the promotion review is on demonstration of the practice of their discipline. The documentation and demonstration of outcomes or impact is required. It is not expected that any candidate will meet all of the examples below but meeting only one will not satisfy the demonstration of collective impact of excellence. Examples of excellence are similar to those required for associate professor, with an expectation of either greater impact or dissemination.

**4 Research Faculty**

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

**a Research Associate Professor**

Candidates for promotion to research associate professor are expected to demonstrate the beginnings of a national recognition of their expertise. This may be reflected by (but not limited to) invitations to review manuscripts or grant applications, invitations to lecture at scientific societies or other universities, consultation with industry or governmental agencies, requests for collaboration from other universities, request to serve in central roles on multi-center studies, etc.

Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research. Promotion to associate professor requires documentation of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship based upon their expertise. Candidates typically should have 20-25 peer reviewed journal publications since their appointment as research assistant professors. First, senior, or corresponding authorships are typically not expected. Overall, the number of publications required for promotion should be sufficient to persuasively characterize the faculty member's influence in helping to discover new knowledge in their field. Thus, both quality and quantity are important considerations. It

should be appreciated that scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive promotion decision. Similarly, records of scholarship below the specified range do not preclude a positive promotion decision.

It is expected that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of 100% salary recovery from extramural sources. Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators, and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigator) is not required.

**b Research Professor**

The awarding of promotion to the rank of research professor must be based upon convincing evidence that the candidate has established a national level of recognition and impact beyond that which was established for promotion to associate professor. This may be reflected by (but not limited to) invitations to review manuscripts or grant applications, invitations to lecture at scientific societies or other universities, consultation with industry or governmental agencies, requests for collaboration from other universities, request to serve in central roles on multi-center studies, etc.

Research faculty typically are not expected to establish an independent program of research. Promotion to professor requires documented evidence of a sustained and substantial record of scholarship. Candidates should have 25-35 peer reviewed journal publications since their appointment as research associate professor. Some first, senior, or corresponding authorships are expected. Overall, the number of publications required for promotion should be sufficient to persuasively characterize the faculty member's influence in helping to discover new knowledge in their field. Thus, both quality and quantity are important considerations. It should be appreciated that scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive promotion decision. Similarly, records of scholarship below the specified range do not preclude a positive promotion decision.

It is expected that the successful candidate will have a sustained record of 100% salary recovery from extramural sources. Research faculty typically serve as Co-Investigators, and independent extramural funding (Principal Investigator or Multiple Principal Investigator) is not required.

**5 Associated Faculty**

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

**a Compensated Associated Faculty**

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

**b Uncompensated Associated Faculty (i.e., Adjunct)**

For uncompensated associated faculty, promotion should reflect contributions to BMI or College that exceed the activities that represent the basis for their faculty appointment, in most cases related to the educational mission. At the associate professor level this could include service on BMI and or college committees, contributions to medical student curriculum development or other evidence of contributions to the educational or scholarly mission of BMI or college. For promotion to professor, the level of contribution must demonstrate sustained and enhanced engagement or leadership.

Procedures for promotion of uncompensated associated faculty:

- Submission of an updated CV
- Letters from two people, including the faculty member's immediate supervisor (i.e., division director or clerkship director), who can attest to the associated faculty member's contributions.
- Teaching evaluations if available
- Letter from the committee of eligible faculty including the vote
- Letter from the chair
- Review and approval by College of Medicine Office of Academic Affairs.

**B Procedures for Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty**

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

**1 Candidate Responsibilities**

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for (1) submitting a complete, accurate dossier and (2) providing a copy of the AP&T document under which they wish to be reviewed. When external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for (3) reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case by the Department.

**Dossier**

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

While the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less (and excluding any information that may have been considered for a previous promotion), to present.



The time period for scholarship documentation to be included in the dossier is the entire duration of the faculty's academic career (including residency or post-doctoral training). For faculty being considered for promotion at the rank of associate professor, the weight of the review is from the date of the initial faculty appointment (including time on faculty at another institution) to the present. For faculty being considered for promotion at the rank of professor, the weight of the review is from the date of the dossier submission for the promotion to associate professor to present. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence over time. There should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or appointment to present. The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond BMI.

**a Documentation**

Faculty members preparing their dossiers for promotion and/or tenure review should consult [Volume 3](#) of OAA's Policies and Procedures Handbook to ensure that all required documentation is included. The following paragraphs provide suggested standards for documenting excellence in Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service.

**Teaching**

Teaching is defined as imparting knowledge, experience, insight, and skill to other persons. In the College of Medicine, teaching must be consistently effective and of high quality. All Tenure Track and Clinical faculty members in the College of Medicine must be engaged in teaching, development of BMI's and College's academic programs, and mentoring of students, and trainees. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated by documentation of teaching activities over a sustained period of time.

A faculty member's quality and effectiveness as a teacher will be documented and assessed through multiple means, including peer evaluation, student evaluation of the instructor, peer review of course documents, and teaching awards.

Yearly, student evaluations, resident & fellow evaluations (when applicable) and peer evaluations, at a minimum, are required. Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated by positive evaluations from students, trainees, local colleagues and national peers. These evaluations include student evaluation of instructor (SEIs) and BMI peer evaluation forms and letters written specifically for peer evaluation. Administration of an assessment tool will not be under the control of the faculty member being evaluated. Faculty members may supplement the required assessment tool with others if they wish. Students and trainees must be provided an opportunity to assess the instructor and course using the required assessment tool in every regular classroom course. Regardless of the instructional setting, effort should be made to obtain evaluations from the largest number of students and trainees possible. When there is a significant discrepancy between the number of students and trainees enrolled and the number providing evaluations, the evaluations cannot be assumed to represent a consensus of student opinion.

Typically documentation of teaching for the promotion dossier will include:

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

For all faculty it should at least cover the time period since appointment, last promotion, or the last five years, whichever is less.

### **Peer evaluation**

Peer evaluation is required on a recurring basis for all faculty members. Peer evaluations may include internal, and/or external review of classroom instruction, clinical teaching and course materials such as syllabi, examinations and instructional materials including textbooks. Assessment by observation of classroom and clinical teaching is most useful when done systematically over time and conducted with the specific goal of offering constructive suggestions.

For every course that a faculty member directs, a peer review will be arranged by the Graduate Studies Coordinating Committee to ensure that the responsibility for arranging for and carrying out peer review activities does not rely on the faculty member themselves. A presence of a yearly peer evaluation will be verified at the faculty member's annual review.

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

Peer evaluation resources can be found at: <https://medicine.osu.edu/faculty/fame/our-programs/educators/peer-review-of-teaching>

### **Scholarship**

Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge and methods by research, study and learning. A faculty member's scholarship must be demonstrated to be of high quality, significance and impact. Scholarship may include all aspects of basic science; clinical research (including clinical trials); and research based on cases or case series, educational outcomes research, development of academic modules, entrepreneurship, etc. The nature of scholarship should be pertinent to the faculty member's track and pattern of responsibilities. Scholarship may incorporate new

and emerging methods of dissemination of findings and methods, including websites, social media, and community engagement.

All tenure track, clinical, and research faculty members (with the exception of faculty on the clinical excellence pathway) must develop a record of scholarship that is documented by a body of original scholarly work over a period of time. The evidence for scholarship must refer to original, substantive works that are documented achievements. Recognition of the scholarly work must also be external to the University, residing in the scientific communities apropos to the faculty member's field of scholarship.

Evidence of scholarship can include but are not limited to: peer reviewed journal articles, bulletins and technical reports, original books and monographs, edited books, chapters in edited books, editor reviewed journal articles, reviews and abstracts, papers in proceedings, unpublished scholarly presentations, externally funded research, funded training grants, other funding for academic work, prizes and awards for research or scholarly or creative work, major professional awards and commendations. Evidence of scholarship may also include invited lectures at other universities, symposia, and conferences; invention disclosures, patent activity, entrepreneurship, technology commercialization, software development; editorship of a major collection of research work; leadership of advanced seminars and symposia under organizational sponsorship; and invitations to serve on national review bodies. BMIs are encouraged to develop innovative ways of defining and measuring scholarship unique to their specific discipline.

Documentation of scholarship also includes grants and contracts submitted and received, and a demonstration of the impact of the scholarship, as documented with citation data, impact factors, book distribution data, adoption of texts or procedures by external BMIs or academic health centers, and so forth.

### **Service**

Service is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, exemplary patient care or application of methodology, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. In BMI, a candidate's service contributions must be demonstrated to be of high quality and effectiveness. All tenure track and clinical faculty members must contribute to service as evidenced by documentation of contributions over a sustained period of time.

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

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

Candidates must also submit a copy of the AP&T document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may submit their BMI's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the AP&T document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the AP&T document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. The AP&T document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to BMI.

### **Publications**

Candidates may supply up to three (3) publications that will be included in the Dossier and provided to external reviewers. These publications should ideally come from the period since their last appointment. Clinical faculty on the teaching or excellence pathway may provide alternative examples of work products.

### **External Evaluations** (see also External evaluations below)

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

### **Internal letters**

Candidates may also request internal letters or collaborator letters be included in the dossier. Request for the inclusion of such letters can be made at the time of submitting their dossier for external review.

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

The responsibilities of the Committee are as follows:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV or dossier and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
  - Faculty members who are not 1) U.S. citizens or nationals; (2) permanent residents ("green card" holders); (3) asylees or refugees; or (4) individuals otherwise described as "protected individuals" pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b) may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as

the result of a mandatory review until the status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of status as a “protected individual” under the immigration laws are moreover not considered for promotion by this department. The committee will confirm the status of an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review with the department chair.

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
  - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external or internal evaluators to Department chair.
  - **Late Spring:** The candidate should be shown the list of potential evaluators by the Promotion & Tenure committee chair to identify any collaborators, conflicts of interest or other issues that could interfere with the objectivity of the reviews, and be invited to augment it with no more than three names of persons who meet the criteria for objective, credible, evaluator.
  - **Summer:** Gather internal evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service from students and peers, as appropriate, within BMI.
  - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
  - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
  - To establish a mechanism for each candidate's dossier to be accessible for review by the eligible faculty (e.g. secure website) at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
  - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
  - The chair of the committee will revise the draft analysis of each case following the 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 BMI Chair.
  - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
  - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to Department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since BMI's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

### 3 Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

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

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

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
- The evaluation by the eligible faculty is not advisory, but rather represents an independent review.
- The Eligible Faculty Committee chair, or designee, will write a letter on behalf of the committee to Department chair reporting the vote and summarizing the discussion of the eligible faculty. This letter will be evaluative as well as descriptive and contextualize the vote, including any "minority opinions" as appropriate. In the event the candidate is on the tenure track, this letter must be written by a tenured faculty at the appropriate rank per University Faculty Rules.

#### **4 Department Chair Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the Department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) Faculty members who are not 1) U.S. citizens or nationals; (2) permanent residents ("green card" holders); (3) asylees or refugees; or (4) individuals otherwise described as "protected individuals" pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b) may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until the status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of status as a "protected individual" under the immigration laws are moreover not considered for promotion by this department. Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this BMI.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a Department chair of any department in which the candidate has a joint appointment. Internal letters will also be sought for Discovery Theme hires and for faculty who complete most of their duties in a Center or Institute. The Department chair will also review request by the candidate for other internal letters (e.g. collaborator letters) and solicit them when appropriate. Finally, internal letters may be required to assess the contributions and impact of team science and for practice activities of clinical faculty on the excellence pathway.

- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- Following receipt of the letter of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and vote, to provide an independent written evaluation and conclusion regarding if a candidate's dossier meets the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the BMI review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and the Department chair
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and the Department chair
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the Department chair, for inclusion in the dossier.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the Department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the Department chair is final in such cases.
- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the Department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department chair or director of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

## **5 Procedures for Associated Faculty**

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

## **6 External Evaluations**

External evaluations are obtained for all relevant promotion and/or tenure reviews. As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department chair, and the candidate. Candidates are permitted to suggest external evaluator names following the criteria below. However, per Faculty Rule [3335-06-04 \(B\) 3](#), "no more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate."

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator (no



shared publications in the last five years, unless part of a very large multi-centered project with a large number of authors), or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the scholarly work. They must be at the rank above the candidate being considered unless an exception has been granted by the college. It is therefore essential that the individual or body generating the list of prospective evaluators ascertain the relationship of prospective evaluators with the candidate before seeking a letter of evaluation. Candidates must be provided the opportunity to propose potential external reviewers and to review the proposed list of reviewers to identify potential conflicts.

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

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

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

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



## **VII Appeals**

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

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

## **VIII Reviews in the final year of probation**

In most instances, a decision to deny promotion and tenure in the penultimate probationary year (11<sup>th</sup> year for faculty members with significant clinical responsibilities, 6<sup>th</sup> year for those without significant clinical responsibilities) is considered final. However, in rare instances in which there is substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is relevant to the reasons for the original negative decision, a seventh (or twelfth) year review may be conducted. The request for this review must come from the eligible faculty and the head of BMI, and may not come from the faculty member himself. Details of the criteria and procedures for a review in the final year of probation are described in University Rule [3335-6-05](#) (B).

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

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

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

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

The Department chair oversees BMI's peer evaluation of teaching process. Annually the Department chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in BMI. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

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

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

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

Peer evaluation of teaching may occur in many different venues, as applicable to a faculty member's primary teaching responsibility. The College of Medicine broadly considers teaching medical students, undergraduate students, graduate students, residents and fellows. Faculty members may be evaluated in activities including but not limited to giving live didactic lectures, listening to recorded lectures or online modules, at continuing education courses, or at workshops whether at Ohio State or elsewhere.

The peer reviewer should focus on such issues as 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 evaluation, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the Department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if they wish. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

## X Appendices

### A Glossary of Terms

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

**AP&T** – Appointments, Promotion and Tenure

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Exclusion of Time** – the ability to have up to three years taken off the time clock toward achieving tenure

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

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

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

**Mandatory review** – a required 4<sup>th</sup> year, 8<sup>th</sup> year, tenure review, or reappointment review.

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

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

**Non-mandatory review** – voluntary promotion or tenure review

**OAA** – Office of Academic Affairs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Research Faculty** – faculty who engage exclusively in research-based scholarship.

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

**SEI** – Student Evaluation of Instruction

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

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

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

**VITA** - the University's online dossier and CV creation tool

## **B AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics**

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.
3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

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