


The Ohio State University College of Dentistry

**Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures**



Revised Version Approved by College of Dentistry Faculty

February 28, 2019

OAA Approved September 8, 2019

Table of Contents

I Preamble	1
II College Mission	1
III Definitions	1
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	1
1 Tenure-track Faculty	1
2 Clinical Faculty	2
3 Research Faculty	2
4 Conflict of Interest	2
5 Minimum Composition	2
B Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	2
C Quorum.....	3
D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	3
1 Appointment.....	3
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal	4
IV Appointments	4
A Criteria.....	4
1 Tenure-track Faculty	4
2 Clinical Faculty	5
3 Research Faculty	6
4 Associated Faculty	6
5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	7
B Procedures	7
1 Tenure-track Faculty	8
2 Clinical Faculty	9
3 Research Faculty	10
4 Transfer from the Tenure-track	10
5 Associated Faculty	10
6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	10
V Annual Review Procedures.....	11
A Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	11
1 Fourth-Year Review	11
2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	12

B Tenured Faculty.....	12
C Clinical Faculty.....	13
D Research Faculty	13
E Associated Faculty.....	13
VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards (Annual Performance Review).....	14
A Criteria.....	14
B Procedures	14
C Documentation	14
1 Teaching.....	15
2 Scholarship.....	15
3 Service.....	16
VII Promotion and Tenure Reviews, Promotion Reviews, and Reappointment Reviews.....	16
A Criteria.....	16
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	16
2 Promotion to Professor.....	18
3 Clinical Faculty	21
4 Research Faculty	22
5 Associated Clinical Faculty.....	23
B Procedures	23
1 Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Reviews and Other Reviews.....	23
2 Candidate Responsibilities.....	24
3 Division Chair Responsibilities.....	24
4 Dean Responsibilities	26
5 Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	26
6 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	28
7 Internal Evaluations.....	28
8 External Evaluations	28
C Documentation	29
1 Teaching.....	30
2 Scholarship.....	32
3 Service.....	33
VIII Appeals.....	34
IX Seventh-Year Reviews	34

X Procedures for Student and Peer Review of Teaching	34
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	34
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	34
Appendix: Suggested Items for Inclusion in Curriculum Vitae.....	37

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<https://trustees.osu.edu/bylaws-and-rules/faculty-rules>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the college and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the college 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 dean.

This document must be approved by the dean, faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments/reappointments 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 college and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to college mission and criteria. The Office of Academic Affairs considers the College of Dentistry to be equivalent to a university department for administrative purposes, with the dean serving as department chair.

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

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal opportunity (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

II College Mission

The College of Dentistry is dedicated to addressing the evolving health care needs of communities in Ohio, the nation, and the world by:

- Providing comprehensive oral and craniofacial health care in an inter-professional health science community
- Educating health care professionals and scientists in a collaborative and diverse academic environment
- Creating, discovering, and sharing knowledge
- Preparing socially responsible and engaged citizens
- Promoting a culture of excellence, respect, and inclusiveness

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1 Tenure-track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the college. For appointment at senior rank, a first vote is taken on the appointment and a second vote is taken on the rank under consideration by the faculty members eligible to vote.

The eligible faculty for senior rank new appointments and for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the college, excluding the dean, the assistant and associate deans, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the college, excluding the dean, the assistant and associate deans, the executive vice president and provost, and the president. Historically, the College of Dentistry has not appointed probationary professors.

2 Clinical Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of clinical faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and clinical faculty whose tenure or appointment, respectively, resides in the college. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for senior rank new appointments, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of clinical faculty consists of all tenured faculty and all nonprobationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate whose tenure or appointment, respectively, resides in the college, excluding the dean, the assistant and associate deans, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

3 Research Faculty

The initial appointment for research assistant professors by the dean is made in consultation with the appropriate division chair, and does not involve a vote of the eligible faculty.

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointments, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the college and all nonprobationary research and clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the college excluding the dean and assistant and associate deans, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

4 Conflict of Interest

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

5 Minimum Composition

In the event that the college does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the dean will appoint a faculty member from another unit within the university.

B Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee

The college has an Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of six tenured faculty members, at least three of whom are at the rank of professor and one professor of

clinical dentistry. The term of appointment is five years. Each year the dean appoints a new member from nominations received from Faculty Council; the dean will request additional nominations if he/she considers that no one in the initial group of nominations is suitable for the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee functions in accordance with Faculty Rules [3335-6-02](#) and [3335-7-05, 08, 09, and 10](#).

The chair is a professor appointed by the dean just before the beginning of the third year of that member's term. The chair's term continues through the third and fourth years, and that person serves as advisor to the succeeding chair in the fifth year and acts as the Procedural Designee. In the year when the former chair has rotated off the committee, the current chair will select another member of the committee to serve as the Procedural Designee. The Procedural Designee should be a professor, since he/she will need to attend eligible faculty meetings for discussion of cases at the professor rank.

When considering cases involving clinical faculty, the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented to have two nonprobationary clinical faculty members appointed by the dean.

Clinical faculty are not eligible to vote on the promotion and/or tenure of tenure-track faculty or promotion of research faculty.

When considering cases involving research faculty, the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by two nonprobationary clinical faculty members and two nonprobationary research faculty members appointed by the dean.

Research faculty are not eligible to vote on the promotion and/or tenure of tenure-track faculty or promotion of clinical faculty. (Faculty Rule [3335-7-37](#))

C Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the dean has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

The dean can attend the meeting, but does not vote. The associate and assistant deans cannot attend the meeting. Members of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee who are eligible by rank count in determining the quorum.

D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

1 Appointment

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

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 a simple majority of the votes cast is positive.

IV Appointments

All faculty appointments in the College of Dentistry are made by the dean, in consultation with the appropriate division chair.

A Criteria

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

For a joint appointment, the College of Dentistry and the other unit(s) should reach agreement on its terms before seeking an individual to fill the position so that these terms can be communicated clearly to candidates. These terms, modified as a consequence of negotiation with a particular candidate where appropriate, must be set forth in a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The MOU must be signed by the dean of the College of Dentistry and both the chair(s) of the other department(s) and the governing dean(s) for the department(s). (See <https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>)

For appointments that have teaching responsibilities, the candidate will be expected to meet the following criteria that will be used for evaluation of teaching effectiveness:

- has knowledge of the subject.
- understands appropriate teaching tools and uses these tools for effective teaching.
- makes efforts for continuous growth and remaining current in the field of expertise.
- has ability to organize and present subject matter with clarity, logic and enthusiasm.
- has capacity to interact effectively with students in order to motivate, stimulate, and inspire them.
- maintains personal attributes of industry, integrity, open-mindedness, objectivity, and fairness.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

The College of Dentistry has two types of tenure-track faculty: Faculty in the first type have a research emphasis, and these faculty have the PhD degree but usually not the DDS or equivalent degree. They are not involved in the clinical teaching of students but may be involved with preclinical and didactic instruction. Dental faculty in the second type have both clinical and research emphasis, and these faculty have the DDS or equivalent degree and may also have the PhD degree. The dental hygiene faculty, who have BS and MS degrees, also belong in the second type. The responsibilities of the second type of faculty include the clinical teaching of students, and these faculty may participate in the college Dental Faculty Practice. The appointment criteria and the promotion criteria (see sections VII.A.1 and VII.A.2) vary for these two types of faculty and their areas of expertise. Scholarship is required for all tenure-track faculty members. Board certification is a positive factor for faculty appointment in clinical areas where such certification is available.

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the applicant lacks a graduate degree and/or experience. The college will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

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

Assistant Professor. An earned terminal degree (DDS/DMD, or the equivalent; PhD, MD, EdD; or MS or the equivalent for dental hygiene) is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the college and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the college's criteria (Section VII) in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2 Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members serve in appointments totaling 50% or more annual employment to the college. The primary responsibility of these faculty members will normally include clinical, didactic, and laboratory instruction and, in some cases, clinic administration. Some scholarship is required.

Appointment of clinical faculty entails a three-, four- or five-year contract. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the college wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Instructor of Clinical Dentistry. Appointment is normally made at the rank of instructor of clinical dentistry when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree (DDS/DMD, or the equivalent; PhD, MD, EdD; or MS or the equivalent for dental hygiene) or not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment. The college will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a four-year contract. In such cases, if

the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

Assistant Professor of Clinical Dentistry. A terminal degree (DDS/DMD, or the equivalent; PhD, MD, EdD; or MS or the equivalent for dental hygiene), and the required licensure/certification, if appropriate in his/her area of clinical expertise, are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor of clinical dentistry. Evidence of ability to teach is required and to produce scholarship is desirable. In clinical areas where appropriate, board certification is a positive factor.

Associate Professor of Clinical Dentistry and Professor of Clinical Dentistry. Appointment at the rank of associate professor of clinical dentistry or professor of clinical dentistry requires that the individual have the required licensure/certification in his/her area of clinical expertise, and meet, at a minimum, the college's criteria (Section VII) — in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship — for promotion to these ranks. In clinical areas where appropriate, board certification is a positive factor.

3 Research Faculty

Research faculty are appointed for a period of one to five years at the discretion of the dean, in consultation with the division chair. The length of the appointment is contingent upon the grant funding of the principal investigator (PI), who may be the research faculty member sponsor, or the research faculty member, or upon division or college support. The appointment letter states the expectations for salary support/recovery, generally requiring 100%, which will be derived from extramural funds. Brief lapses in extramural funding may be covered using other funds if approved by the dean in consultation with the appropriate division chair.

The initial appointment is probationary, with the appointment letter stipulating that the individual will be reviewed annually for continuation, up to five years. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. If the research faculty member or the PI providing support wishes to consider appointment renewal beyond two years or beyond that stipulated in the original letter of appointment, a review of the faculty member by the division chair and dean is required in the penultimate year of the current appointment period. The reappointment contract may be renegotiated during the appointment period only with the voluntary consent of the research faculty member. A new letter specifying the period is required for each subsequent appointment. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Research Assistant Professor

Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of publications in high-quality refereed journals that strongly indicate the ability to support an externally funded research program of a principal investigator (PI).

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

4 Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments are generally part-time and are made for up to three years in length (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>). Associated faculty may be reappointed.

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

Clinical Instructor of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor of Practice, Clinical Associate Professor of Practice, Clinical Professor of Practice. Associated clinical appointments may be salaried or non-salaried. Associated clinical rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of clinical faculty. Associated clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of clinical faculty.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are rarely compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give some academic service to the college, such as teaching a course or collaborating in scholarship activities, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be salaried or non-salaried. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three years at 100% FTE.

5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the College of Dentistry by a faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in the college. Appropriate active involvement includes collaboration in scholarship activities, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, substantial other academic service, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B Procedures

The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) Policies and Procedures Handbook presents university policies on Faculty Recruitment and Selection (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyrecruitment.pdf>) and on Faculty Appointments (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>).

Information is provided on the following topics

- Recruitment of tenure-track, clinical and research faculty.
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit.
- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30. OAA will not approve letters of offer dated after April 30 to faculty holding a tenure-track appointment at another AAU institution unless the letter is accompanied by evidence that the other institution has granted such permission.
- Appointment of foreign nationals.
- Letters of offer.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyrecruitment.pdf>).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The dean provides a written approval for the division chair 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 dean appoints the search committee and its chair, in consultation with the division chair. The search committee consists of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the division. The dean may appoint faculty from other divisions in the college and from other colleges who could benefit the search process. The dean may also appoint students, residents, part-time faculty, and others as appropriate who could benefit the search process.

Every search committee member is required to have participated in an orientation on hiring for inclusive excellence within 24 months prior to a search. Inclusive hiring practices training is available through the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity. Every search committee must have a diversity advocate with special responsibility for assuring that the search is conducted according to affirmative action principles. See the OHR policy on Affirmative Action, Equal Employment Opportunity, and Non-Discrimination/Harassment (Policy 1.10) (<https://hr.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/policy110.pdf>) for guidance concerning this role. Advertising is rarely sufficient to accomplish the above goals. Networking and other forms of personal contact with those in a position to recommend or to be candidates are usually required.

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 Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (<https://hr.osu.edu/>) and external advertising, subject to the division 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, and credentials. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as until the position is filled, 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. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that an online advertisement is active for at least 30 days in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency, and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the

search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure-track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated professional journal.

- Screens applications (which include CV's) and letters of recommendation and presents to the dean a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the dean agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the dean's office. If the dean does not agree, the division chair in consultation with the dean determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, or suspend the search).
- In some cases, such as the search for a division chair or an associate dean, off-campus interviews may be necessary. The procedures for off-campus interviews are developed by the search committee in consultation with the dean. Following completion of the off-campus interviews, the remainder of the process proceeds as described below when on-campus interviews are completed.

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with and feedback from faculty groups, including the search committee; students/residents; the division chairs; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and others on their scholarship and area of expertise, which may be administration. This enables assessment of teaching ability and knowledge in the field of expertise. Detailed interviews with search committee members and other staff and faculty provide further assessments. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the search committee meets to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. The chair of the search committee prepares a report on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates judged by the committee to be worthy of consideration by the dean. This report is submitted to the dean without a ranking of the candidates.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members review the CV and external letters of recommendation, and vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. Five letters from external evaluators are required for review, following the same protocol for promotion of currently appointed tenure-track faculty to senior ranks. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. 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. The chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the dean. In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the dean decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the dean.

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The college will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

2 Clinical Faculty

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

3 Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the on-campus interview the candidate is asked to make a research presentation, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the dean.

4 Transfer from the Tenure-track

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

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

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

5 Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the division chair in consultation with the dean.

Appointment of non-salaried adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the college. If the proposal is acceptable to the division chair, the division chair in consultation with the dean extends a verbal offer and the dean extends the formal, written offer.

Associated faculty appointments are generally made for a period of up to three years, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated faculty appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the non-salaried academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester basis.

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

6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the non-salaried academic service to the division justifying the appointment is considered at a division faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by a simple majority of the division faculty and division chair, the recommendation is then forwarded to the dean for consideration. The division chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for renewal or nonrenewal to the dean.

V Annual Review Procedures

The college follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on (1) performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, in relation to the percent effort allocated, (2) on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual, and (3) on criteria for the rank and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the division chair no later than April 30.

The annual review letter must include a reminder per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#) 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 Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

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

If the division chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The division chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The division chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean. 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 division 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 reviewed by the dean who makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1 Fourth-Year Review

The fourth-year review of probationary faculty is different from preceding annual reviews in that it requires consideration by the eligible faculty, and recommendation of reappointment or nonrenewal of appointment by the dean must be forwarded to the executive vice president and provost who makes the final decision. The format for documentation and procedures for submission follow that for review for promotion and tenure.

Probationary faculty members seeking a renewal of appointment for the fifth year must present a dossier to the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee by August 1 of the fourth year (see Section VII.B.1). The dossier must contain the elements required by the University for a fourth-year review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

The division chair should submit his/her letter of recommendation for the fourth-year review to the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee by the August 1 deadline.

External evaluations are only solicited when the division chair, in consultation with the chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee, determine that they are necessary to conduct the

Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee does not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

The Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the dossier for completeness and consistency.

During October, all eligible faculty (above the rank of the probationary faculty member) will have an opportunity to review the dossier online or in the dean's office and provide written commentary for discussion at the meeting of the eligible faculty.

The chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee will call for and lead a meeting of the eligible faculty at which discussion of the candidate's credentials and a vote on the candidate's suitability for reappointment will occur. The guidelines for the review are delineated at this meeting by the chair.

The chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee will present to the assembled eligible voting faculty an in-depth analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, with attention to the candidate's adequacy in meeting the standards in teaching, scholarship, and service. These comments will provide a starting point for a discussion of the candidate by the assembled eligible faculty, prior to a vote of that body. The results of the vote, summaries of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee's analysis, and the discussion by the eligible faculty will be forwarded in a confidential letter to the dean by the first week of December.

The letter written by the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee for the candidate will become a part of the candidate's dossier. The dean will then perform an independent review. Regardless of whether the review is favorable or unfavorable, the probationary faculty member will be notified by the dean of the outcome and will have the option of having ten calendar days from the date of notification to submit a written comment. Any comment from the candidate, along with the dean's response, will become part of the dossier, which is then submitted to the executive vice president and provost. Only one iteration of the comment process is permitted.

The dossier is also retained as a part of the faculty member's records. It becomes available to the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee and the eligible faculty during the sixth-year review process.

2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

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

B Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the division chair. The chair conducts an independent assessment of performance based on the criteria for the rank and identified goals, then meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics, which is submitted to the dean. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are also reviewed annually by the division chair. 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 College of Dentistry, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

C Clinical Faculty

The annual review process for clinical probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, although the standards or criteria vary.

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

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds in the manner described in section VII.B.2. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

D Research Faculty

The annual review process for research probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure probationary and tenured faculty, although the standards or criteria vary. The chair will follow the recommendation of the PI, when the PI is providing salary support. If funding for the research faculty member is discontinued, continued support is at the discretion of the dean, in consultation with the division chair. If the PI providing support leaves the College of Dentistry, for whatever reason, continuation of the research faculty appointment in the College is at the discretion of the dean, who will consult the division chair. If the position will not continue, the research faculty member is informed by the dean about the termination of his/her appointment at the end of the present support period. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

E Associated Faculty

Associated faculty in the college generally have part-time appointments. The division chair performs formal annual reviews for associated faculty. Issues about performance are communicated from the division chair to the faculty member during the annual review. The dean is notified by the division chair about such communications.

VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards (Annual Performance Review)

A Criteria

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.

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions and reappointment decisions for clinical faculty. The college research incentive plan (https://dentalintranet.osu.edu/system/files/college_of_dentistry_research_incentives_policy.pdf) will be followed. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 12 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity over the past three years. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual 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.

B Procedures

The division chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in percent rates or dollar amounts, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves a distribution that reflects the merits of college faculty. The dean considers the continuing productivity of the faculty member, along with market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her salary adjustment should submit written justification to the division chair who will then discuss it with the dean. If the faculty member continues to be dissatisfied with the decision, he/she may be eligible to file a formal salary appeal. (See the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>.) The college's Faculty Salary Appeals document also provides guidance about this matter.

C Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two bulleted summary documents, be submitted to the division chair no later than June 1.

- College annual review documentation prepared using OAA-approved electronic program, showing performance in teaching, scholarship, and service for past year.
- Updated CV that includes the items suggested in the Appendix as appropriate for the faculty member.

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not

document publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the editor stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

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

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 12 months.

1 Teaching

The college has many teaching venues. For example, students are taught in pre-clinical laboratories, lectures, seminars, individual instruction, small group tutorials, remediation sessions, clinics, and continuing education. Some students are mentored and directed in research and other scholarship activities.

The following documents are appropriate for evaluation of teaching:

Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for classes taught.

Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the division's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in section X of this document). Two peer evaluations during the review period are required by the university for faculty who are being considered for promotion. The different teaching roles for faculty (such as course director, lecturer, bench instructor, or mentor) will receive due consideration for evaluation of teaching.

Other relevant documentation of teaching may also be submitted when appropriate. Examples include evidence of teaching innovation, production of substantial new course materials, teaching awards, outcomes from national board examinations, and student evaluations of clinical teaching.

2 Scholarship

The College of Dentistry recognizes that faculty scholarship can have many forms, such as traditional data-driven laboratory and clinical research, research in educational methods and technology, and publication of books/manuals that present new information. The more general criterion of *scholarship* is used instead of *research* for faculty evaluation. The following documents are appropriate for evaluation of scholarship:

Copies of scholarly works, including pedagogical works, published or accepted for publication. A scholarly or pedagogical work accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the editor stating that it has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.

Documentation of grants and contracts awarded, including role on the grant (PI, Co-I or other), source, duration and amount of funding.

Other documentation also demonstrating evidence of scholarly activity, such as published abstracts for presentations at professional/scientific society meetings, published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, and grant applications and contract proposals that have been submitted.

Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the editor stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

3 Service

The following documents are appropriate for evaluation of service:

Documentation of traditional division, college, and university service; service outside of the university (e.g., committees for professional organizations, reviewing for journals, and editorial board memberships); and patient care.

Documentation of other activities making a contribution to the college mission and the image of the University, including community service in dental-related and appropriate non-dental organizations.

VII Promotion and Tenure Reviews, Promotion Reviews, and Reappointment Reviews

A Criteria

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

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

In the College of Dentistry, the effort allocation as determined by the division chair will have primary importance in considering faculty performance for the review processes in the following sections.

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to

the college's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university. It is the expectation of the university and the College of Dentistry that all faculty promoted to associate professor with tenure are on a trajectory that will result in them achieving the rank of professor.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the college's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, if a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be pre-professional teaching, then excellence in pre-professional teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics (<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>).

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

Candidates must demonstrate that they are likely to provide a sustained contribution to the college and university mission in teaching, scholarship, and service. The standards presented here are intended to provide candidates and their division chairs with general goals and guidance for faculty development during the probationary period. The following standards represent basic performance levels and do not guarantee tenure and/or promotion. To reiterate, quantity and quality of activity in one area cannot substitute for requirements in another area.

Tenure track – research emphasis

For this type of faculty appointment, the candidate is expected to provide evidence of teaching, scholarship and service as follows:

- 1) Evidence of teaching must include:
 - a. Demonstration of effective skills as a teacher, including evidence of achieving a level of excellence in teaching through student reviews, peer reviews, reports from Peer Review of Teaching Committees, and outcomes.
 - b. Participation in teaching activities to a degree that is consistent with division goals and adequate in quantity and frequency to permit a fair and meaningful evaluation of the candidate's skills and development. The quantity and role of teaching will be considered.
- 2) Evidence of scholarship must include:
 - a. Demonstration of an independent scholarly program that is likely to be sustainable and establishes the candidate's expertise and ability.
 - b. Primary authorship of scholarly publications that are predominantly data-based appearing in well-respected refereed journals.
 - c. Nationally competitive peer-reviewed funding from federal entities (e.g., NIH or NSF), charitable foundations, industry, and/or other highly regarded external entities.

Publications should indicate sustained productivity and allow evaluation of scholarship by internal and external reviewers. The number of publications will vary with the work and discipline.

- 3) Evidence of service must include:
 - a. Participation on college and/or university committees during most of the time in rank.
 - b. Membership in professional organizations and contributions to professional activities outside of the university.

Tenure track – clinical and research emphasis

For this type of faculty appointment, the candidate is expected to provide evidence of teaching, scholarship and service as follows.

- 1) Evidence of teaching must include:
 - a. Demonstration of effective skills as a teacher, including evidence of achieving a level of excellence in teaching through student reviews, peer reviews, reports from Peer Review of Teaching Committees, and outcomes.
 - b. Participation in teaching activities to a degree that is consistent with division goals and adequate in quantity and frequency to permit a fair and meaningful evaluation of the candidate's skills and development. The quantity and role of teaching will be considered.
 - c. Course directorship, which includes oversight on preparation and distribution of course materials, management of lecture/laboratory schedules, and conducting of all examinations.
- 2) Evidence of scholarship must include:
 - a. Demonstration of an independent scholarly program that is likely to be sustainable and establishes the candidate's expertise and ability.
 - b. Primary or major authorship of scholarly publications that include a significant portion that is data-based, appearing in well-respected refereed journals.
 - c. Competitive peer-reviewed funding from federal entities (e.g., NIH or NSF), charitable foundations, industry, university/college granting body, and/or other regarded entities.
- 3) Evidence of service must include:
 - a. Participation on college and/or university committees during most of the time in rank.
 - b. Membership in professional organizations and contributions to professional activities outside of the university.
 - c. Demonstration of outstanding clinical skill in patient care if appropriate. Examples include board certification if applicable, peer review observations from faculty colleagues, and unsolicited letters of commendation from patients.

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, 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. International reputation of a candidate may be evidenced by invitations for presentations at international scientific conferences, educational institutions, and professional organizations. In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the

same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered. Historically, the College of Dentistry has not appointed probationary professors.

The candidate for promotion to professor should be a college role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. The candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with the goals and mission of the college and university. The candidate for professor must have achieved a national reputation in teaching, scholarship and service. International reputation in these areas is highly desirable. The standards presented here are intended to provide the candidates and their division chairs with general goals and guidance for faculty development during the post-tenure period. The following standards represent basic performance levels and do not guarantee promotion.

Faculty with research emphasis

The candidate for professor is expected to have the PhD or DDS degree, and to provide evidence of teaching, scholarship and service as follows:

- 1) Evidence of teaching ability must include:
 - a. Demonstration of effective skills as a teacher.
 - b. Demonstration of a sustained level of excellence in teaching.
 - c. Mentoring of PhD students or postdoctoral researchers or faculty.

Evidence is provided through student course evaluations (SEI), peer reviews of lectures, and outcomes.

- 2) Evidence of scholarship must include:
 - a. A sustained and continuous record of scholarship throughout the post-tenure period that is recognized as excellent by peers.
 - b. Primary authorship of scholarly publications that are predominantly data-based appearing in well-respected, refereed journals. An explanation of the team science is needed, with an emphasis on the specific expertise of the candidate and its relevance for the research outcomes.
 - c. Major responsibility for the design and execution of the candidate's scholarly program.
 - d. Sustained nationally competitive peer-reviewed funding from federal entities (e.g., NIH or NSF), charitable foundations, industry, and/or other highly regarded entities.
 - e. Invitations to participate in scientific presentations and forums, or to contribute to publications in the discipline.
 - f. Publications with PhD students, postdoctoral researchers, and faculty as a mentoring outcome.

Publications should indicate sustained productivity and allow evaluation of scholarship by internal and external reviewers. The number of post-tenure publications will vary with the work and discipline.

- 3) Evidence of service must include:
 - a. Leadership role on college and/or university committees with significant, recognized contributions.
 - b. Leadership role in professional organizations outside the university with major recognized contributions.
 - c. Participation in study sections or equivalent reviewing bodies for grant applications (e.g., NIH or NSF), if appropriate to the candidate's field of research.

- d. Peer-reviewing of manuscripts for journals with national/international reputations, and/or membership on editorial boards.

Faculty with clinical and research emphasis

The candidate is expected to provide evidence of teaching, scholarship and service as follows:

- 1) Evidence of teaching must include:
 - a. Demonstration of effective skills as a teacher, including a sustained level of excellence in teaching through predoctoral student reviews, reviews by residents, peer reviews and outcomes.
 - b. Significant contributions in the following areas:
 - i. Advancing the teaching program through curriculum revision.
 - ii. Management of a significant portion of the teaching program.
 - iii. Mentoring predoctoral or master's students.
 - iv. Developing and presenting continuing college-sponsored education.
- 2) Evidence of scholarship must include:
 - a. A sustained and continuous record of scholarship throughout the post-tenure period that is recognized as excellent by peers.
 - b. Primary or major authorship of scholarly publications that include a significant portion that is data-based appearing in well-respected refereed journals.
 - c. Major responsibility for the design and execution of the candidate's scholarly program.
 - d. Sustained competitive peer-reviewed funding from federal entities (e.g., NIH or NSF), charitable foundations, industry, university/college granting body, and/or other regarded entities.

Publications should indicate sustained productivity and allow evaluation of scholarship by internal and external reviewers. The number of post-tenure publications will vary with the work and discipline.

- 3) Evidence of service must include:
 - a. Participation in graduate education activities, with Category M faculty status from the Graduate School. (<https://gradsch.osu.edu/handbook, section 12.3>)
 - b. Leadership role on college and/or university committees with significant, recognized contributions.
 - c. Leadership role in professional organizations outside the university with major recognized contributions.
 - d. Peer-reviewing of manuscripts for journals with national/international reputations, and/or memberships on editorial boards.
 - e. Demonstration of excellent clinical service in patient care if appropriate.
 - f. Leadership in an administration role that demonstrates impact to the College and is evidenced in presentations across the profession nationally.

For a clinician scholar who has a position with major administrative responsibilities, such as associate dean, division chair, or program director, and only limited time for scholarship, the nature, quality and impact of scholarship produced during the period as an administrator will be given strong weight for promotion, along with scholarship produced after receiving associate professor rank before assuming the administrative position. It is recognized that the scholarship during the appointment with major administrative responsibilities may lie along alternative paths than traditional scientific discovery. If the faculty member has limited or no teaching responsibilities, evidence must be provided about his/her communications abilities. Strong weight will also be placed on administrative (service) activities that can be documented to have moved the division or college in a forward direction, indicating the specific outcomes that were produced.

3 Clinical Faculty— (See Section VII.B.3.e for reappointment without promotion for clinical faculty)

Criteria by faculty category are as follows: (The College of Dentistry does not appoint Clinical Faculty to the rank of Instructor.)

A) Promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Dentistry

For the clinician educator, the candidate is expected to provide evidence of teaching, scholarship and service as follows:

- 1) Evidence of teaching must include as appropriate:
 - a. Demonstration of effective skills as a teacher, including evidence of a level of excellence in teaching through student/resident reviews, peer reviews, teaching committee input, and outcomes.
 - b. Significant contributions to advancing the teaching program as a course director or through management of major teaching offerings.
 - c. Demonstration of innovation of teaching methodology.
 - d. Demonstration of excellence in college-sponsored continuing education.
- 2) Evidence of scholarship must be demonstrated with publications and presentations that are one or more of the following: data-based, laboratory or clinical technique, literature review, case report, educational methods, or novel teaching materials.
- 3) Evidence of service must include:
 - a. Participation on college and/or university committees during most of the time in rank; or
 - b. Participation in professional or educational organizations and contributions to professional activities outside of the university.

Board certification, if applicable, is an indicator of clinical skill in patient care service, and carries weight for promotion.

When considering the dossier for promotion (or for reappointment without promotion) of a clinical faculty member holding a formal (e.g., director) administrative position, evidence of accomplishments is required in the administrative role, which is considered to be principally service, although teaching and scholarship may be involved. This evidence is given weight proportionate to the time required to fulfill the administrative role.

Successful promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Dentistry will conjointly include reappointment for 3, 4, or 5 years at the new rank, at the discretion of the dean in consultation with the appropriate division chair. This new reappointment will take effect regardless of time remaining on the previous reappointment schedule and with the voluntary consent of the faculty member being promoted.

B) Promotion to Professor of Clinical Dentistry

For the clinician educator, the candidate is expected to provide evidence of teaching, scholarship and service as follows:

- 1) Evidence of teaching must include:
 - a. Demonstration of effective skills as a teacher, including evidence of a sustained level of excellence from student/resident reviews, peer reviews, teaching committee input, and outcomes.
 - b. Significant contributions to advancing the teaching program through curriculum revision.
 - c. Management of a major portion of the teaching program.

- d. Demonstration of sustained excellence in college-sponsored continuing education.
 - e. Demonstration of innovation of teaching methodology.
- 2) Evidence of scholarship must be demonstrated with sustained peer-reviewed publications and presentations that are one or more of the following: data-based, laboratory or clinical technique, literature review, case report, educational methods, or novel teaching materials
 - 3) Evidence of service must include:
 - a. Leadership on college and/or university committees during time in rank.
 - b. Leadership in professional organizations outside of the university.

Board certification, if applicable, is an indicator of clinical skill in patient care service, and carries weight for promotion.

When considering the dossier for promotion (or for reappointment without promotion) of a clinical faculty member holding a formal (e.g., director) administrative position, evidence of accomplishments is required in the administrative role, which is considered to be principally service, although teaching and scholarship may be involved. This evidence is given weight proportionate to the time required to fulfill the administrative role.

Successful promotion to Professor of Clinical Dentistry will conjointly include reappointment for 3, 4, or 5 years at the new rank, at the discretion of the dean in consultation with the appropriate division chair. This new reappointment will take effect regardless of time remaining on the previous reappointment schedule and with the voluntary consent of the faculty member being promoted.

4 Research Faculty

The primary responsibility of these faculty members will be to conduct research. A research faculty member may, but is not required to, participate in limited educational activities in his/her area of expertise, with approval by the dean in consultation with the appropriate division chair. The appointment period, which can be for up to 5 years, is made by the dean in consultation with the appropriate division chair.

A) Promotion to Research Associate Professor requirements:

- 1) Evidence of sustained scholarship with recognized expertise.
- 2) Primary/senior author of articles in high-quality refereed journals reporting data-based research.
- 3) Funding from competitive external sources, with evidence of substantial role (PI or Co-Investigator), such as federal entities (e.g., NIH or NSF), foundations, and industry that has provided salary support.
- 4) Evidence of research mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students. (Graduate faculty status is needed for service as director of an MS or PhD thesis, or as a member of an MS or PhD thesis committee, and requires approval of appropriate Graduate Studies Committee and the Graduate School).
- 5) Research service activities at the local or national level.

B) Promotion to Research Professor requirements:

- 1) Sustained scholarship judged to be excellent by peers.
- 2) Substantial primary or senior authorship of publications in high-quality refereed journals reporting data-based research
- 3) Major responsibility for design and execution of scholarship.
- 4) Sustained and substantial funding from competitive external sources, with evidence of leadership role (PI or Co-Investigator), such as federal entities (e.g., NIH or NSF), foundations, and industry that has provided salary support.

- 5) Invitations to present lectures and participate in research forums (NIH study sections are particularly noteworthy).
- 6) Evidence of research mentoring at a high level. Examples are PhD students, postdoctoral researchers and faculty. (Graduate faculty status is needed for service as director of a PhD thesis, or as a member of a PhD thesis committee, and requires nomination by the appropriate Graduate Studies Committee and approval by the Graduate School).
- 7) Leadership role in college, university, national or international research committees or organizations.

For both A) and B), four to five external letters of evaluation are required for promotion, but not for reappointment without promotion.

For all faculty promotions, patents and invention disclosures will be given strong weight under scholarship, with further consideration given to commercialization.

5 Associated Clinical Faculty

Associated clinical faculty members are faculty members of the college on a special appointment. To be eligible for promotion, faculty must be employed by the college for a minimum of 1/2 day per week. The promotion of associated clinical faculty has the same criteria as the respective promotion for clinical faculty.

B Procedures

The college'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](#) (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the college.

1 Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Reviews and Other Reviews (The deadline is the following Monday when a specific date falls on the weekend.)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| August 1: | Dossiers for fourth-year reviews, promotion reviews, tenure reviews, and first reappointment reviews submitted to the dean's office. Division chairs submit lists of external evaluators, if required. |
| August/
September: | Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews dossiers and chair meets with candidates, if necessary. |
| October: | Eligible faculty have access to dossiers and submit written comments. |
| November 1: | Reappointment packages for clinical faculty and research faculty not undergoing first-time reappointment. |
| Second Thursday:
in November: | Meeting of eligible faculty to vote on fourth-year reviews, promotions, tenure, and reappointments. |
| December 1: | Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee chair provides dean with letter reflecting faculty vote on each candidate. |

2 Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist (<https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/forms/Form-105-fillable.pdf>) 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 on the OAA checklist. Candidates should schedule a meeting with their division chair at least 1 month prior to submitting for promotion/tenure action to discuss the promotion/tenure process and evaluate the candidate's credentials.

Candidates are also responsible for submitting a copy of the APT document under which he or she wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the college's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted.

If external evaluations are required, the candidate and division chair develop a list that is submitted to the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three names and may request the removal of no more than two names from the division chair's list, providing the reasons for the request. The division chair decides whether removal is justified, consulting with the chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. (Also see External Evaluations below.) The final list must not contain more names from the candidate than the division chair.

Dossier checklist for candidates for August 1 submission to Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- a. Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form (most recently revised document – see <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/Form109.pdf>).
- b. Personal Statement letter to the college Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee outlining major accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
- c. Curriculum Vitae — The CV should include items listed in the Appendix, as appropriate for the candidate.
- d. Core dossier prepared using OAA-approved electronic program. The dossier should also contain administration responsibility information when appropriate and complete teaching information, which includes a detailed summary of the student evaluations and a detailed summary of the peer evaluations of teaching from the division peer review of teaching chair. Approved college forms for evaluation in the areas of course administration, lecturing, clinical teaching, laboratory, and seminar can be found at <https://dentalintranet.osu.edu/content/faculty-teaching-support>
- e. Appendices: letters of acceptance for publications in press, representative reprints of publications.
- f. For subsequent (not initial) reappointment actions only, a core dossier may be submitted or a CV may be provided that includes all information from the date of the last reappointment, as well as a personal statement and summaries of peer and student evaluations of teaching.

3 Division Chair Responsibilities

- a. Initiates the peer review process to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of the faculty candidate,

which is included in the dossier for promotion and tenure, promotion, or reappointment.

- b. Provides a letter evaluating the faculty candidate for both mandatory and non-mandatory reviews. This letter should summarize achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service that reflect the criteria for which the candidate is seeking promotion or reappointment, and should explicitly state the degree of success or failure on the part of the candidate in meeting yearly goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service that were established by the division chair and candidate. This letter is expected to provide an assessment of the faculty candidate and explain whether the candidate has met the effort allocation established by the division chair, along with reporting the achievement details..
- c. For promotions where substantial scholarship is involved, provides a list of potential external evaluators to the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- d. For a clinical faculty member applying for initial reappointment, the division chair appoints a review committee specific to that faculty member and identifies a committee chair from the eligible faculty in the division, who will coordinate the division evaluation of the reappointment dossier for the entire period since the previous appointment. The division chair, in consultation with the dean, will appoint eligible faculty from another division if needed to have a reviewing committee of at least three members above the rank of the faculty member for assistant and associate professor reappointment and at the rank of professor for professor reappointment. The review committee will contain at least one tenured faculty member and one clinical faculty member, and one faculty member (who may be non-voting) from the division for the faculty member being reviewed. The review committee chair in the division for the faculty member applying for reappointment will convene a meeting of the review committee to discuss the dossier and vote on reappointment. The review committee chair will then prepare and submit a letter to the division chair that reports the discussion and vote by the review committee members, and which is signed by all committee members. This letter becomes part of the official dossier. For the first reappointment without promotion, the dossier is reviewed by all eligible faculty in the college at the same or higher rank.
- e. A clinical faculty member seeking promotion from Assistant Professor of Clinical Dentistry to Associate Professor of Clinical Dentistry, or from Associate Professor of Clinical Dentistry to Professor of Clinical Dentistry, initiates this process by submitting a letter to the division chair. The process subsequently follows the procedures for promotion reviews described in Section VII.B.
- f. For cases where the clinical faculty member is seeking subsequent reappointment without promotion, the dossier is only reviewed at the division level by the process described in the preceding section and presented directly to the dean for reappointment consideration. A clinical faculty member applying for a subsequent reappointment without promotion may submit a complete core dossier with attachments and letters or, alternatively, a reappointment document containing a CV, personal statement, peer evaluations of teaching, student evaluations of teaching, and information about course administration, lecturing, seminar, clinical and/or laboratory teaching. These documents and the review committee and chair letters must be submitted to the Dean's office no later than November 1 (or first business day in November).
- g. The initial decision about reappointment for a research faculty member is first made by the division chair, in consultation with the PI if he/she is providing salary support for the research faculty member (see Section V.D). Performance during the entire period since the initial appointment is evaluated. The division chair letter with the recommendation is then forwarded to the dean, who makes the final decision about reappointment. A research faculty member

seeking promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor, or from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor, initiates this process by submitting a letter to the division chair. The process subsequently follows the procedures for promotion reviews described in Section VII.B.

- h. Notifies the Dean's office by August 1 about candidates from the division who will be submitting dossiers for promotion/tenure/reappointment.

4 Dean Responsibilities

- a. Prepares a list by February 1 of faculty requiring review by the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and notifies respective faculty and their division chairs.
- b. Where relevant, verifies 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 not considered for promotion by the college.
- c. Prepares copies of each candidate's dossier for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the faculty meeting where specific cases are discussed and voted on.
- d. Removes 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.
- e. Prepares an independent letter assessing the performance of the faculty candidate that is submitted to the executive vice president and provost. This letter contains a judgment of the overall contribution of the faculty member to the college, rather than a reiteration of performance details in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
- f. Meets with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- g. Informs each candidate in writing after completion of the review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and division chair;
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and division chair;
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the division chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the division chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- h. Provides a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

5 Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

- a. The committee reviews candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; works with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

- b. The chair meets with each candidate for clarification as necessary and provides the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her dossier. This meeting is optional at the discretion of the candidate, and is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- c. The chair solicits the external review letters.
- d. The committee meets as a group to discuss each faculty candidate, and draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, which will be presented at a meeting of the eligible faculty.
- e. At a meeting of the eligible faculty, the chair reviews and analyzes the candidate's dossier, indicating the extent to which the evidence meets established criteria/standards for promotion or tenure. This analysis will provide the starting point for a full and open discussion by the assembled eligible faculty of the candidate's documented accomplishments, followed by a vote of that body. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- f. The chair prepares and submits a letter to the dean not later than 2 weeks after the meeting of the eligible faculty (by approximately December 1). The letter will (1) enumerate the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as indicated by the eligible faculty, (2) evaluate the dossier/achievements relative to the criteria of the rank to which the candidate aspires, (3) indicate the decision and vote of the eligible faculty, and (4) attest to the adherence of the process to the policies of the college and university. The letter is signed by the chair and all committee members, and will become part of the dossier.
- g. The committee will provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

Additional responsibilities of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- a. Review the college Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document annually and recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- b. Recommend to the dean appropriate rank for new appointments.
- c. Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the dean in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another college. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the division's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee begins meeting on College of Dentistry cases.

The committee will annually consider requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed. The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review. 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.

Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the division chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are not considered for promotion by this college.

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

6 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

- a. Determine the appropriateness of non-mandatory reviews.
- b. Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- c. Attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

7 Internal Evaluations

Each candidate for mandatory fourth-year, tenure or promotion review must have a minimum of four letters of evaluation in his/her dossier from college or university faculty at the same or higher rank that attest to his/her contributions to the teaching and/or service missions of the college or university, as appropriate for the appointment. Two names will be suggested by the candidate, and two names will be suggested by the division chair. The division chair submits these names to the chair of the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee who solicits such letters.

Of particular benefit to the review process are letters from the directors of courses in which the candidate provided instruction and chairs of committees for which the candidate was a member. The letters from course directors should comment on any aspect of the candidate's contributions to the course (e.g., lecture organization, format, and delivery; completeness of handouts; quality of examination questions; ability to meet deadlines). Chairs of college or university committees should comment on the candidate's overall contributions to the committee (e.g., attendance at meetings, level of preparation for meetings, and participation in meeting discussions).

For a candidate having a joint appointment with another department outside of the College of Dentistry, a letter from the other department chair is requested by the chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee, that will contain details about the performance of the candidate in that department, with consideration of the responsibilities and effort allocation associated with the joint appointment. If the joint appointment involves more than one department outside of the College of Dentistry, a letter is requested from each department chair.

8 External Evaluations

External evaluations of research and other scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research contract renewal and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of research and other scholarly activity are not obtained for clinical faculty

members unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a clinical faculty member will be made by the division chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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, collaborator in scholarship, 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. The College of Dentistry will normally only solicit evaluations from tenured professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State, but in the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from tenured associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the college cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than early in the autumn semester of 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 external evaluators is assembled by the chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee and the division chair. 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 the college requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The college follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided under External Letters for P&T at <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

C Documentation

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the 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 the candidate.

Promotion and tenure decisions for individuals are made on the basis of documentation of evidence grouped into the categories of teaching, scholarship and service. Documentation in each category is organized in a hierarchy of relative importance in the evaluation process. The hierarchy within each area of consideration is based upon established and proven concepts for peer and administrative evaluation, yet its breadth provides a range of opportunities to demonstrate achievement and value to the university and college. The organization of evidence presented here is intended to help faculty to focus their activities in those areas that will allow them to document their strengths most convincingly.

Among the three areas, teaching and scholarship are the primary pursuits of faculty and are particularly important at the sixth-year evaluation, although evidence of service is important.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the college. The documentation of scholarship and service noted below is for use during the college review only, unless reviewers at the university level specifically request it.

1 Teaching

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty, it is the date of the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. The evidence provided includes:

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries are prepared by the Office of the University Registrar for every class exceeding a minimum enrollment), Summaries of division-approved student evaluation forms can also be included.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the division's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the section X of this document).
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. A document accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the editor stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. Such materials are also evidence of scholarship.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate, such as teaching awards.

Teaching is one primary role of the faculty. Teaching effectiveness as indicated by peer and student evaluation, outcomes, and indication of competency by students, is the strongest indicator of teaching quality. The quantity of teaching in and of itself is not an indicator of quality of effort. A candidate should demonstrate a breadth of activity that is consistent with peers, reflective of division and college needs, and sufficient in amount to allow evaluation of quality and the candidate's responsiveness to evaluation.

Faculty members are encouraged to enroll in continuing education related to their teaching assignments, including completion of Teach @ OSU (<https://uitl.osu.edu/>).

The three areas of documentation for teaching include in order of decreasing importance: measures of teaching effectiveness, supplemental teaching activities, and other contributions.

Teaching Effectiveness

An effective teacher must be able to impart knowledge and stimulate the development of problem solving skills. Peer evaluation of teaching is considered the primary form of evaluation. Guidelines and

procedures for peer evaluation at the college have been established by the Office of Academic Affairs. During the probationary period, peer evaluation must take place on an annual basis. Initiating the process of peer evaluation is the responsibility of the division chair. Peer evaluations, especially when supported by a faculty peer review committee, and student evaluations of teaching carry most weight when they provide evidence of the candidate's growth and development, or consistent and sustained teaching quality, over the entire evaluation period.

Where possible, student evaluation of teaching should utilize instruments approved by the college faculty and the Office of Academic Affairs. All instruments, where possible, should include division-approved measures. It is desirable that comparisons can be made within the college and university. The results should be presented in a summary format that allows for reasonable interpretation similar to the university's standard SEI report. Sequential evaluation of teaching, using an accepted instrument in a course or series of courses, is most valuable for documentation of teaching effectiveness.

Teaching evaluation by peers and students should ideally address all areas of a candidate's activity. This should include an evaluation of the candidate's mastery of and currency in discipline content. Student evaluations of teaching should take place annually. Lecture, seminar, laboratory and clinical teaching should be weighted in proportion to the candidate's teaching responsibility. Optimally the faculty member's performance in each course he/she participates should be evaluated every time that course is taught. This is a requirement for the course director. (The University Registrar normally requires a minimum course enrollment for online SEI's.) However, the format can vary when a faculty member participates in team teaching. In that case the weight of the evaluation should be proportional to a faculty member's contribution to the course. For those faculty members who do not serve as director for any courses, i.e., they participate only in team teaching efforts, it is necessary that their most significant efforts be documented on a regular basis. Each teaching evaluation should be shared among the faculty member, chair, and dean's office.

Finally, the evaluation should follow data-gathering procedures that ensure objective and valid information. Strong efforts by the course director, emphasizing the importance of this process, should be made to assure that student evaluations (SEI forms), which are now performed online, are completed by a majority of students.

Teaching awards acknowledge outstanding teaching accomplishments through student and peer recognition. Division, college, and university level awards document high-quality teaching, with university level awards holding the most influence, followed by college and then division awards.

Outcomes of the educational process are extremely important, but often are difficult to document. Student performance in subsequent courses, national board examinations, licensing board examinations, standardized tests, or clinical qualifying examinations, where they are directly related to the candidate's teaching, can provide a strong indication of effectiveness.

Supplemental Teaching Activities

The contribution to the educational process can include activities outside of the classroom such as graduate mentoring, teaching innovation, and publications about teaching. Often these activities are individualized and difficult to quantify in terms of effort, contribution and level of achievement. They are important and integral to academic vitality, and should be documented by the candidate.

Graduate teaching activities noted by decreasing relative weight include: serving as principal advisor for graduate student research, serving on thesis committees, and informal involvement with individual graduate student research. Faculty who are eligible by graduate faculty appointment status but with little or no activity are at a disadvantage at promotion. Teaching innovation in such areas as curriculum, teaching methods and new organization of course materials is an important accomplishment and may

have significant value. These innovations may encompass a number of media that are appropriate to the content and student audience.

Publications regarding teaching technique, those based on education or philosophy without empirical data, and instructional aids or materials are also contributions to the teaching effort. These also may include a number of media that are appropriate to the content and student audience.

Other Contributions

Other teaching contributions may support candidacy for promotion. They are viewed as indicators of the breadth of a candidate's teaching and provide insight into the involvement of the faculty member in the full range of teaching. Continuing education can embody elements of academic teaching, and is most valued when documented by peer and participant evaluation. Service as a pre-doctoral and/or baccalaureate student advisor and/or as a peer-teaching mentor is also important. A candidate's self-evaluation and statement of teaching philosophy can provide additional and helpful information about values, approach and philosophy as a teacher, and becomes more important if validated by other evidence, such as peer evaluations and student evaluations.

2 Scholarship

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of the last promotion to present. Evidence should include:

- A complete and accurate list of all publications. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the editor stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- A complete and accurate list of all grants and contracts received, including source, funding, duration, and role of faculty member (e.g., PI, Co-I or other).
- Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate. Examples are patents and invention disclosures, published reviews, including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grant applications and contract proposals that have been submitted, impact factors of journals in which publications appear, and the h-index which is one measure of the impact of the published work by the candidate.

Scholarly publications are essential. The number of scholarly publications will vary among faculty seeking promotion, and no absolute number of publications has been established for promotion in rank or tenure. Numbers should be sufficient to demonstrate a commitment to scholarship, productivity, quality, focus of the candidate's work, the ability to sustain effort, and recognition by peers.

Three kinds of activity are important indicators of scholarship:

Written Communication

- Published papers
Articles in refereed journals provide the strongest evidence of scholarship. Publications in which the candidate is primary, sole, or senior author are the most highly valued. In those disciplines where data collection is customary, a portion of the publication should be data-based.
- Patents awarded by the U.S. Patent office and invention disclosures.
These are viewed as evidence of original work and will provide evidence of scholarship.

- Book chapters or solicited papers.

These can be important, but may be considered weaker, indicators of high-quality scholarship. This category also includes textbook authorship, textbook editorship, or textbook chapter authorship. The major factors determining the weight of publications in this category are novelty, substance, and impact on the discipline.

- Case reports and clinical technique papers

These should be a limited portion of the scholarly activities being evaluated. Descriptive case reports without interpretation are considered one of the least significant written indicators of scholarship.

Research Funding

- Peer-reviewed, competitive research grants from federal or other significant organizations for the field.
- Research funding from private industry.
- Research grants from university organizations.
- Research grants from college organizations.
- Research grants from foundations and philanthropic organizations.

The amount of funding is not an absolute measure of scholarship, since disciplines and funding environments vary. The greatest weight is placed on rigorously peer-reviewed funding from federal agencies and other highly respected sources, rather than proprietary or noncompetitive support. The primary investigator's role is more highly valued, and greater contribution to a collaborative project lends increased importance to the candidate's promotion application.

Research Abstracts and Presentations

- Published research abstracts in major journals for the field of the candidate.
- Presentations at meetings of scientific or educational organizations in the field of the candidate.
- Invited presentations (other than continuing education lectures)

Research abstracts add evidence of sustained and directed scholarship, as well as work in progress. However, they carry far more weight when an article based on the work is published. Invited presentations at conferences (which may result in published abstracts) or to other professional groups provide evidence of the candidate's reputation outside of the university.

3 Service

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of the last promotion to present. Evidence should include any available documentation of the following:

- Elected offices held and/or service on committees in professional organizations (local, regional, national, international).

- Service on college and university committees, including offices held or special assignments.
- Administrative positions in division or college.
- Editor or invited reviewer for journals, book, or funding agencies.
- Membership on division committees.
- Memberships on special/ad hoc committees other than standing committees.
- Memberships on hospital committees.
- Consultation services.
- Community health education activities.
- Membership in educational or research societies or organizations.
- Engagement in clinical dental practice.

Leadership positions having impact and effectiveness in organizations are important, and these are evidenced by factors such as (a) advancement in standing, (b) unsolicited requests for reappointment, (c) requests for participation in programs, and (d) requests to act as a consultant.

VIII 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.

IX Seventh-Year Reviews

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

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of an evaluation of instruction form is required in every course offered in this college. University SEI forms may be used, as well as student evaluation forms developed by the division. Other approved forms are found under Instructional Resources for the college Office of Academic Affairs (<https://dentalintranet.osu.edu/node/1620>).

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is administered through the college Office of Academic Affairs, which assures that the process is standardized and consistent across the college. The college Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for providing guidelines and instructions for the peer evaluation of teaching process.

The division chair oversees the division's peer evaluation of teaching process. Appropriate forms for peer reviews are found under Instructional Resources for the college Office of Academic Affairs (<http://dentalintranet.osu.edu/archive/OAADocs/SK/PR/forms.html>).

Annually the division chair appoints Peer Review of Teaching Committees of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the faculty. A committee may include faculty from outside of the division. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured and reappointed clinical faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the division. 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 responsibility of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee for each probationary faculty member is to review formally the teaching of the probationary tenure-track or clinical faculty member twice during the probationary period, with the goals of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year and providing constructive comments. The Committee for the faculty member reviews the SEI information for courses/lectures taught each year, along with peer review of teaching observations by Committee members.

The division chair has the responsibility of ensuring that sufficient peer review of teaching occurs for nonprobationary faculty members so that adequate documentation will exist when promotion of tenure-track faculty or reappointment/promotion of clinical faculty is being considered. Rather than having formal peer review committees as done for probationary faculty, division faculty members (and faculty from other divisions as needed) are asked to provide reports of nonprobationary faculty members' teaching effectiveness, using the approved college form for peer reviewing. All faculty members have the responsibility of providing SEI or peer review information to the division chair for the annual review.

- The teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate clinical professors should be reviewed at least twice during every five-year period and at least twice during the appointment period for clinical faculty.
- The teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary clinical professors should be reviewed once every three years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- At the division chair's request, peer review of teaching can occur for 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.
- A peer review of teaching for a faculty member not currently scheduled for review can also occur, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time and resources permit. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The division chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [University Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the division chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation (the first two situations listed above) is comprehensive and includes, as appropriate, classroom visitation, clinical/laboratory visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and examinations. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure, at the beginning of the semester, a division Peer Review of Teaching committee, which is specific for each faculty member being reviewed, will request a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate, such as when examinations are being given or guest speakers are scheduled. Each peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If

possible, each peer reviewer should attend (or review if an online course) two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. Both probationary and nonprobationary faculty members are evaluated, and the peer review committee examines copies of the particular faculty member's SEI summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the committee attempts to ascertain the reasons. In so doing, members are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the semester, and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently, their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

At the conclusion of the review, the committee submits a written report to the division chair, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the committee may respond in writing to those comments if it wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's dossier, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative. They provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews, and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching.

The effectiveness of the peer teaching evaluation procedures outlined above would be strengthened if the division developed worksheets for use in evaluating the various aspects of instruction.

Table for teaching evaluations – college Office of Academic Affairs oversees and has tools to evaluate

Faculty	When	Evaluation by Whom
Probationary Faculty	Two times formally during the probationary period, with annual SEI and peer review information also compiled	Division Peer Evaluation of Teaching Committee
Associate Tenured Professors	Two times in five years	Division Faculty (reported to chair)
Associate Clinical Professors	Twice in appointment time or twice in five years – whichever is the longer time period depending on contract	Division Faculty (reported to chair)
Tenured Professors or nonprobationary Clinical Professors	Once every three years	Division Faculty (reported to chair)
Low performing teaching	As requested by division chair	Division Faculty (reported to chair)
Faculty member request	Formative	Faculty member selects

Appendix

Suggested Items for Inclusion in Curriculum Vitae

In the document, separate the items into four major areas of (1) Background and General Information, (2) Teaching, (3) Research, and (4) Service.

- Contact information: work and home addresses, telephone numbers and e-mail addresses.
- Education history: universities, programs, and degrees with year for award.
- Employment history: company names and addresses; position with concise description of responsibilities.
- Dental practice history: practice location(s) and date(s), noting nature of practice.
- Military service history: branch of military, rank, and dates for service.
- Academic appointment history: institutions, faculty rank, and dates of appointment.
- Memberships in professional organizations and other societies relevant to expertise.
- Honors and recognitions from educational institutions, professional societies, and other highly regarded entities.
- Teaching experience: institutions, course names and numbers with brief course descriptions, role (director or participating faculty), level of students, and information about specific lectures presented.
- Continuing education presentations: list title, date, location, and group for presentation.
- Lectures and presentations at meetings of professional societies, dental organizations, or other highly regarded organizations: list title, date, location, and name of group for lecture or presentation.
- Mentoring experience: list graduate students, indicating whether MS or PhD level, and noting periods for mentorship and whether degree awarded; include participation on thesis committees and candidacy examination committees; list undergraduate student mentoring details, noting whether baccalaureate or predoctoral dental students; include information about student awards.
- Publications: separate into peer-reviewed journal articles, books/book chapters, and non-peer-reviewed journal articles, with full article citation information (authors, title, journal, volume number, pages and year) or full book chapter information (book title, publisher, date, chapter title and pages). Designate whether published, under review for publication, or submitted for publication.
- Published abstracts for presentations at professional society meetings: list journal, authors, title, volume number, page and year; note if abstract was refereed.
- Research funding: separate into federal agencies, state agencies, manufacturers, and other funding entities; provide brief project description with title, duration, and amount of funding (direct and indirect costs); indicate role on project (principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or project collaborator).
- Service activities: separate into university service (indicating level: division, college, or university); professional service at local, state and national levels; and public service; indicate periods of service; provide brief details where needed to explain nature of service.