

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, & TENURE
DOCUMENT**

**DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL INFORMATICS
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF MEDICINE**

Revised: August 19, 2005
Revised: May 6, 2009
Revised: August 8, 2011
Revised: January 2, 2014
Revised: September 21, 2015
Revised: March 5, 2018

CONTENTS

I	PREAMBLE	4
II	DEPARTMENT MISSION	4
A.	MISSION.....	4
B.	DEFINITION	4
1.	<i>Vision</i>	4
2.	<i>Values</i>	5
III	DEFINITIONS	5
A.	COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY.....	5
1.	<i>Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee</i>	5
2.	<i>Tenure-track Faculty</i>	5
3.	<i>Research Faculty</i>	5
4.	<i>Clinical Faculty</i>	5
5.	<i>Conflict of Interest</i>	6
6.	<i>Minimum Composition</i>	6
B.	QUORUM.....	6
C.	RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY	6
1.	<i>Promotion and Tenure</i>	6
IV	APPOINTMENTS	6
A.	APPOINTMENT CRITERIA	6
1.	<i>Tenure-track Faculty</i>	7
2.	<i>Research Faculty</i>	8
3.	<i>Clinical Faculty</i>	9
4.	<i>Associated Faculty</i>	10
5.	<i>Courtesy Appointments for Faculty</i>	11
6.	<i>Emeritus Faculty</i>	12
B.	APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES.....	12
1.	<i>Tenure-track Faculty</i>	12
2.	<i>Research Faculty</i>	13
3.	<i>Clinical Faculty</i>	14
4.	<i>Transfer from the Tenure-track</i>	14
5.	<i>Associated Faculty</i>	14
6.	<i>Courtesy Appointments for Faculty</i>	14
V	ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES	15
A.	PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	15

1.	<i>Fourth Year Review</i>	15
2.	<i>Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period</i>	16
B.	TENURED FACULTY	16
C.	RESEARCH FACULTY	17
D.	CLINICAL FACULTY	17
E.	ASSOCIATED FACULTY	17
VI	MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	17
A.	CRITERIA	17
B.	PROCEDURES	18
C.	DOCUMENTATION	18
VII	PROMOTION & TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	18
A.	CRITERIA	18
1.	<i>Tenure-track Faculty</i>	19
2.	<i>Research Faculty</i>	21
3.	<i>Clinical Faculty</i>	23
4.	<i>Associated Faculty</i>	26
B.	PROCEDURES	26
1.	<i>General</i>	26
2.	<i>Annual Guidelines by the OAA</i>	27
3.	<i>Review of Eligible Candidates</i>	27
4.	<i>Candidate Responsibilities</i>	27
5.	<i>Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee</i>	27
6.	<i>Department Chair Responsibilities</i>	28
7.	<i>External and Internal Evaluations</i>	29
8.	<i>Verification of Citations in Dossier</i>	30
9.	<i>Objectivity of the Process</i>	30
C.	DOCUMENTATION	30
1.	<i>Teaching</i>	31
2.	<i>Research</i>	31
3.	<i>Service</i>	31
VIII	APPEALS	32
IX	SEVENTH YEAR REVIEW	32
X	PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	32
APPENDIX A	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

I PREAMBLE

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

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

The Dean of the College or their designee and the Office of Academic Affairs must approve this document before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and 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 department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to the department's mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) and other standards specific to this department and college, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Faculty members are evaluated for their contributions to the multi-part mission of the department, the College of Medicine, and The Ohio State University. Evaluation encompasses accomplishments in:

- Research and scholarship,
- Teaching,
- Education,
- Innovation,
- Program development and service (including activities in support of the patient care mission of the department or College of Medicine).

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 DEPARTMENT MISSION

A. MISSION

To improve people's lives through innovation in research, education, and patient care.

B. DEFINITION

Biomedical Informatics is the field that is concerned with the optimal use of information, often aided by the use of information technology, biotechnology and people, to improve individual health, health care, public health, population health, clinical science and basic science biomedical research.

1. Vision

To lead the advancement of health and biomedicine through the development, application, and dissemination of novel biomedical informatics theories and methods capable of driving biological discovery, generating and translating knowledge, and advancing personalized and population healthcare.

2. **Values**

The values of the Department of Biomedical Informatics are as follows:

Our eminence is first and foremost a function of the diversity and strength of our faculty, staff, and trainees.

Continuous assessment and optimization of department-wide strategies and the allocation of resources is critical to the successful satisfaction of our vision and mission.

The principles of openness, transparency, efficiency, individual responsibility, and shared governance are critical to the creation of a collaborative and high performance workplace.

We will constantly strive to achieve balance and excellence in all aspects of our tripartite mission, placing particular emphasis on our role as researchers, educators, and practitioners working to create the future of personalized healthcare.

The dissemination of the knowledge generated by our scholarly activities to the broader biomedical and life science communities, as well as the biomedical informatics, computational science, biostatistics science, and health service research communities, are central to our departmental mission and vision.

III DEFINITIONS

A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

1. **Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee**

As per Chapter [3335-6](#) of the rules of the University Faculty, the voting Appointments, Promotions and Tenure (“AP&T”) Committee of the department includes all eligible faculty. The committee of eligible faculty for particular faculty cases are defined below. This committee is responsible for the evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion, and to assist the chair in identifying potential external reviewers for candidates being evaluated for tenure and promotion. The committee chair is appointed from the eligible faculty by the department chair.

2. **Tenure-track Faculty**

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

For tenure reviews of probationary faculty, eligible faculty are tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered for the candidate whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and associate and assistant deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

3. **Research Faculty**

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new hires, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered for the candidate whose tenure resides in the department and all non-probationary research and clinical faculty of rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered for the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and associate and assistant deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

4. **Clinical Faculty**

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new hires, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of clinical faculty consists of all tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered for the candidate whose tenure resides in the department and all non-probationary clinical faculty of rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered for the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and associate and assistant deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

5. Conflict of Interest

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

6. Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean or his/her designee, will appoint an additional faculty member from other departments within the University, until the number of eligible faculty members undertaking that review is three or more.

B. QUORUM

For decision-making that involves **a committee of the eligible faculty**, a quorum will consist of 2/3 of such faculty members 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 department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

C. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

In all votes taken on personnel matters as defined below, 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. Promotion and Tenure

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for promotion and tenure decisions is secured when 2/3 of votes are in the affirmative (“yes”).

IV APPOINTMENTS

The [Rules of the University Faculty](#) permit the College of Medicine to make appointments in four categories: Tenure-track; Clinical; Research; and Associated.

The appropriate appointment for Department of Biomedical Informatics faculty members must reflect the differing qualifications associated with such appointments, be congruent with the job description of the position within the department, and be consistent with both the short-term and long-term career plans of the individual.

A. APPOINTMENT CRITERIA

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality and impact of scholarly activities underway or planned as part of the departments’ strategic plan. Important considerations include the individual's record in research, teaching, and service; potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and potential for interacting with both students and local, regional, national, and international colleagues in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. No offer will be extended to a faculty candidate if the search process does not yield one or more such candidates who would enhance the quality of the department per the preceding criteria.

1. **Tenure-track Faculty**

The Tenure-track exists for those faculty members who seek to achieve and sustain a program of scholarship focusing on the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge with demonstrated national and international levels of significance and peer recognition. In addition, excellence in teaching and outstanding service to The Ohio State University is required, but alone is not sufficient for progress.

These appointments are made in accordance with University Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>). The appointment process requires the department to provide sufficient evidence in support of a tenure-track faculty appointment so as to ensure that the faculty candidate has clearly and convincingly met or exceeded applicable criteria in research, teaching, and service. Candidates for appointment at senior ranks (associate professor, professor) should undergo an appropriate review by the committee of eligible faculty. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

i. Appointment: Instructor on the Tenure-track

An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary. During the probationary period a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Appointments at the rank of instructor are appropriate for individuals who do not yet have the requisite terminal degree to fully assume the range of responsibilities of an assistant professor. When an individual is appointed to the rank of instructor, the letter of offer should indicate the specific benchmarks and achievements required for promotion to assistant professor.

An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment. Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean of the college or their designee, and the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

- Anticipated receipt of an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Individuals who have completed all the requirements of their terminal degree, but who have not obtained the final degree at the time of initial employment will be appointed as an Instructor.
- Evidence of potential for excellence in scholarship. Such evidence might include peer-reviewed publications in a mentored setting. It is not anticipated that such individuals will have received independent, extramural funding at this point in their career.
- Evidence of potential for excellence in teaching and mentorship.
- A demonstrable track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors.
- In aggregate, accomplishments related to the above criteria should be sufficiently compelling that the appointee is judged to have significant potential to attain tenure and a distinguished record as a faculty member in the college.

ii. Appointment: Assistant Professor on the Tenure-track

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary. During a probationary period a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually. Tenure cannot be awarded at the rank of assistant professor. An assistant professor must be reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of service; however, promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement so merits. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the provision of University Rule 3335-6-08 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) and the provision of University Rule 3335-6-03 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).

For appointments at the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit of up to three years may be granted for work experience at the time of the initial appointment. Doing so requires the approval of the eligible

faculty, department chair, dean of the college or their designee, and Executive Vice President and Provost. Prior service credit shortens a probationary period by the amount of the credit and once granted cannot be revoked except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

Criteria for appointment to the rank of assistant professor include the following:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a relevant field of study.
- For individuals not possessing a terminal degree in relevant field, post-doctoral experience and training in a relevant field is highly desirable.
- Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, acquisition of extramural funding, high quality teaching, and high quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable.
 - Includes, but not be limited to, evidence of teaching competence during graduate, post-doctoral training or prior employment, publications in peer-reviewed journals or presentation of peer-reviewed conference papers at major conferences in the field of specialization, initial development of a focused area of research or scholarship, an attitude which reflects adherence to standards of ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors.
- Strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the academic ranks.

iii. Associate Professor and Professor

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

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria 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.

2. Research Faculty

Research appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on either collaborative research or scholarship. A research faculty member may, but is not required to, participate in limited educational and service activities. Research faculty members are expected to contribute to the department’s research mission and are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected by high quality peer-reviewed publications and successful competition for extramural funding. While research faculty may serve as PI on a grant proposal, securing extramural funding as PI is not expected. However, participation as co-I or collaborator in extramural funding proposals is expected and required.

Research appointments are made in accordance with University Rule 3335-7 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty in a department, the total number of research and clinical faculty must comprise no more than forty nine percent of the total number of tenure-track, research and clinical faculty in the department. In all cases, however, the number of research faculty positions in the department must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in the department.

Tenure is not granted to research faculty. Contracts for research faculty members will be for a period of at least one year and for no more than five years, and must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, it is expected that research faculty appointments will require 100% salary recovery when reasonable. It is expected that salary recovery will be derived from a combination of extramural funds, service line activities and other sources. The initial contract for research faculty is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be

reappointed for the following year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

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

i. Appointment: Research Assistant Professor

Candidates for appointment as a research assistant professor must provide clear and convincing evidence that he or she satisfies the following criteria:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or possession of equivalent experience.
- For individuals not possessing a terminal degree in a relevant field, post-doctoral experience and training in the field is highly desirable.
- An initial record of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by having begun to develop a body of research, scholarship, and creative work, and initial evidence indicating the ability to create and sustain a research program supported through extramural funds.
- A mindset and track record reflecting adherence to standards of professional ethical conduct consistent with the “Statement on Professional Ethics” by the American Association of University Professors. Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

ii. Research Associate Professor and Research Professor

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

3. Clinical Faculty

There are two pathways for the clinical faculty: scholar and educator. Clinical-scholar appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on service at the health system, college, or department level, in support of organizational needs, such as service lines or clinical operations. Clinical-educator appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs for biomedical investigators and students at the health system, college, or department level. Clinical faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and education missions, as reflected by participation in graduate program development and teaching and high quality peer-reviewed publications. While clinical faculty may serve as PI on a grant proposal, securing extramural funding as PI is not expected. However, participation as co-I or collaborator in extramural funding proposals may be expected of some clinical track faculty per their letter of offer.

Clinical appointments are made in accordance with University Rule 3335-7 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty in a department, the total number of research and clinical faculty must comprise no more than forty nine percent of the number of tenure-track, research and clinical faculty in the department. In all cases, however, the number of clinical faculty positions in the department must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in the department.

Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. Contracts for clinical faculty members will be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years, and must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, it is expected that clinical faculty appointments will have significant salary recovery

from service line activities and teaching responsibilities. It is expected that salary recovery will be derived from a combination of extramural funds, service line activities, teaching revenue and other sources. The initial contract for clinical faculty is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

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

i. Appointment: Assistant Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics

Candidates for appointment as an assistant professor of clinical biomedical informatics in both scholar and educator pathways must provide clear and convincing evidence that he or she satisfies the following criteria:

- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or possession of equivalent experience.
- For individuals not possessing a terminal degree in a relevant field, advanced research and/or clinical training and experience in the field is highly desirable.
- Strong potential for career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

Additional criteria for assistant professor of clinical biomedical informatics in scholar include an initial record of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by a developing body of research, scholarship, publications and/or creative work that are related to the dedicated clinical service.

Additional criteria for assistant professor of clinical biomedical informatics in educator include an initial record of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by a developing body of research, scholarship, publications and/or creative work that are related to the education; and evidence for training program development and teaching.

ii. Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics and Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics

Appointment at the rank of associate professor of clinical biomedical informatics or professor of clinical biomedical informatics requires that the individual has a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated appointments exist for faculty members who focus on a specific and well-defined aspect of the college mission, most commonly focused on instructional or trainee mentorship activities in the context of the Department of Biomedical Informatics.

Associated Faculty, as defined in the *Rules of the University Faculty* 3335-5-19 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>), include “persons with adjunct titles, clinical practice titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles,” plus “professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than fifty per cent service to the university.” Members of the associated faculty are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. Appointments to the Associated Faculty are for up to three years at a time. Renewal decisions are based upon the faculty member’s continued contributions to the teaching, administration, service, and scholarly activities of the department. There is no presumption of renewal.

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

- Have written support for appointment by the department chair.
- Have significant and meaningful interaction in at least one of the following mission areas of the Department of Biomedical Informatics, including:
 - a) Teaching or mentorship of graduate and professional students. If the associated faculty member is interested in serving as the primary advisor for graduate students in the department, his/her mentorship role shall be approved by the education committee in the Department of Biomedical Informatics.
 - b) The conduct of original research; and/or
 - c) Administration and operation of departmental programs and services.

i. Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor

Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct appointments may be made for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. With the exception of visiting faculty, associated faculty may be reappointed.

ii. Lecturer

Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

iii. Senior Lecturer

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

iv. Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%

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

v. Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. 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 consecutive years at 100% FTE.

5. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

A no-salary appointment for a tenure-track, research, or clinical faculty member from another department is considered a Courtesy appointment. An individual with an appointment in one department may request a

Courtesy appointment in another department when that faculty member's scholarly and academic activity overlaps significantly with the discipline represented by the second unit.

Such appointments must be made in the same faculty type, using the same title, as that offered in the primary department. Courtesy appointments are warranted only if they are accompanied by substantial involvement in the academic and scholarly work of the department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. Such appointments shall be made on an annual, renewable basis, at the discretion of the department chair.

6. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty are tenure-track, research, or clinical faculty who, upon retirement, were recommended by the chair, the dean of the college or their designee, and the Executive Vice President and Provost for emeritus status. Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters, but may have such other privileges as individual academic units or the Office of Human Resources may provide.

B. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

General

Faculty appointments forwarded from the department for approval by the college will be made consistent with this document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College of Medicine, (2) the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, including the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

All draft letters of offer to faculty candidates must be submitted to the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs of the College of Medicine for review and approval. The draft letter of offer will be reviewed for consistency with the essential components required by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs Policies Handbook.

For additional details concerning University policies and guidelines governing appointment procedures, please see the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

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 in advance by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the [OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

- a. The dean of the college or their designee, at the request of the department chair, will provide approval for the department to commence a search process.
- b. The department chair will appoint a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. When appointing such a search committee, the department chair will designate one of the members as the chair of that committee, responsible for overseeing the performance of the following tasks:
 - i. Appointment of a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
 - ii. Development of a search announcement for internal posting in the University Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (hr.osu.edu) and external advertising (including both printed and web based formats), subject to the department

chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search.

- iii. Development and implementation of 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 advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), 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 professional journal.
- iv. Development and implementation of procedures for screening of applications and letters of recommendation for potential faculty candidates and selections of a sub-set of those individuals to be invited for on-campus visits with the consent of the department chair. The business office of the department will coordinate these visits, under the oversight of the search committee chair.
- c. On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with a broad cross-section of department faculty, staff, and trainees, as must include the department chair and the dean or his or her designee. In addition, it is anticipated that with rare exceptions, faculty candidates will make a presentation during a department seminar during their on-campus visit. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.
- d. Following completion of on-campus interviews, the members of the search committee will solicit feedback via a structured survey instrument from all departmental faculty members as well as staff and trainees involved in the candidate's site visit. This survey will include the ability to provide feedback regarding the qualifications of the potential faculty member relative to the education, research, and service missions of the department; overall alignment with current faculty expertise and focus areas; and a recommendation regarding whether an offer of hire should be extended to the individual being evaluated. The search committee will then review and synthesize such feedback, and subsequently take an advisory vote on the suitability of the individual in question with regard to extending an offer of employment. The outcome of this advisory votes is to be forwarded to the department chair, who will make a final determination whether an offer is to be extended to the candidate being recommended by the committee (if any).
- e. If the offer involves senior rank, the committee of eligible faculty will vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank (please note that this vote is distinct from that described in item d above). The results of the vote are provided to the Office of Academic Affairs, along with the other documentation required for offers at a senior rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the committee of eligible faculty is to vote on such credit.
- f. If more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first.
- g. The department chair determines the details of any offer of employment extended to a faculty candidate, including compensation.

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.

2. Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty should be undertaken with adherence to the general guidelines described for tenure-track faculty. Highly qualified research candidates may occasionally be considered for appointment without a national search when there is a reasonable likelihood that a national search would not result in finding more highly qualified and more diverse candidates. Exceptions to the requirement of a national search must be obtained from the dean of the college or their designee.

Appointments at senior rank will require approval by the college dean or their designee and OAA.

3. Clinical Faculty

Searches for clinical faculty should be undertaken with adherence to the general guidelines described for tenure-track faculty. Highly qualified clinical candidates may occasionally be considered for appointment without a national search when there is a reasonable likelihood that a national search would not result in finding more highly qualified and more diverse candidates. Exceptions to the requirement of a national search must be obtained from the dean of the college or their designee.

Appointments at senior rank will require approval by the college dean and OAA.

4. Transfer from the Tenure-track

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

Transfers from a clinical appointment and from a 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 regular national searches for such positions.

5. Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of associated faculty will not require formalized search processes. Offers of these faculty appointments are decided by the department chair or their designee.

Any faculty member in the department may propose appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty to the chair, who will make the determination of to extend such an appointment.

Associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be renewed in order to be continued. Adjunct appointments are uncompensated and may be renewed only when the 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 term-by-term or an annual basis.

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

Initial appointments to a paid position as an associated faculty member should follow the same procedures as those utilized by the department and the college for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that a national search is not required. In addition, initial appointments at a senior rank require prior approval by the college dean or their designee and OAA.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a faculty member from another OSU department. These appointments will not require a formalized search process, but are approved by the chair.

The chair or their designee must review all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified. A courtesy faculty appointment forwarded from a department for approval by the college must have been made consistent with that department's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document, and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Office of Human Resources.

Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal, but continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing academic involvement as described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures [Volume 1](#): 2.4.1.6.

V ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Faculty Annual Review Policy](#).

The department chair or his or her faculty designee must conduct an annual review of **every** faculty member, irrespective of rank, in accordance with University Rule 3335-6-03(<http://trustees.osu.edu>), and the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The annual reviews are based on the following major criteria:

- Expected performance in teaching, research and service
- Additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and
- Progress toward promotion, where relevant.

The faculty member must maintain an up-to-date relevant electronic or alternative dossier formats as stipulated by OAA. The department may create and utilize additional, standardized evaluation tools to support and inform the annual review process. The department chair or his or her faculty designee will supply each faculty member with a written evaluation of his or her performance, in narrative format. Annual reviews must include an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair. If a chair's designee conducts the annual review, there must be a mechanism for apprising the chair of each faculty member's performance. The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) 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 department chair or their designee, 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. This review process may be informed in part by a preliminary review of materials prepared and submitted by the faculty member for the purposes of their annual review, as assessed by the department's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. This review must include quantitative measures of faculty productivity, a set of objective and goals for the coming academic year, and a qualitative evaluation of the faculty member's satisfaction of such objectives and goals as set during the prior year's review. These components are to be included in the aforementioned written evaluation.

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

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth Year Review

Each faculty member in the fourth year of probationary service must undergo a review utilizing the same process as the review for tenure and promotion, with these exceptions: external letters of evaluation will not be solicited, and the dean, not the department chair, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. The objective of this review will be to determine if adequate progress towards the achievement of promotion and tenure is being made by the candidate.

If the eligible faculty and/or the department chair recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean or their designee makes the final decision.

2. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

University guidelines for Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period are specified in University Rule 3335-6-03 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>), and are reproduced as follows:

- (1) *An untenured tenure-track faculty member will have time excluded from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six. The department chair will inform the office of academic affairs within one year of the birth of a child or the adoption of a child under age six of a probationary faculty member unless the exclusion of time is prohibited by paragraph (D)(3) of this rule. The probationary faculty member may choose to decline the one-year exclusion of time from the probationary period granted for the birth or adoption of a child under six years of age by so informing her/his TIU head, dean, and the office of academic affairs in writing before April 1 of the new mandatory review year following granting of the declination. The exclusion of time granted under this provision in no way limits the award of promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory review year (see paragraph (D)(2) of this rule). The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period per birth event or adoption of children under age six is one year.*
- (2) *A probationary tenure-track faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or various factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful university faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, or service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted to the department chair. Requests will be reviewed by the department's promotion and tenure committee, which will advise the department chair regarding their appropriateness. Such requests require approval by the department chair, dean, and executive vice president and provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to April 1 of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.*
- (3) *A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a nonrenewal notice has been issued nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the university's right not to renew a probationary appointment.*
- (4) *Except in extraordinary circumstances, a maximum of three years can be excluded from the probationary period for any reason or combination of reasons for an instructor, assistant professor or associate professor. Exceptions require the approval of the department chair, dean, and executive vice president and provost.*
- (5) *Tenure-track faculty members will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period for any of the above reasons unless their absence from campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical.*
- (6) *For purposes of performance reviews of probationary faculty, the length of the probationary period is the actual number of years of employment at this university less any years of service excluded from the probationary period under the terms of this rule. Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted under the terms of this rule.*

B. TENURED FACULTY

Non-probationary tenure-track faculty members are to be reviewed annually by the department chair or his or her designee. The department chair or his or her designee meets with each faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation in narrative format. This review process may be informed in part by a preliminary review of materials prepared and submitted by the faculty member for the purposes of their annual review, as assessed by the department chair or their designee. This review must include quantitative measures of faculty productivity, a set of objective and goals for the coming academic year, and a qualitative evaluation of the faculty member's satisfaction of such objectives and goals as

set during the prior year's review. These components are to be included in the aforementioned written evaluation.

C. RESEARCH FACULTY

The annual review process for research probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for Tenure-track probationary and Tenured faculty respectively.

In the penultimate year of a research faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. This review will utilize the same process as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the review dossier will include the research faculty member's (re)appointment letter, annual review letters, CV, and a summary document describing their accomplishments since the last appointment. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract. If reappointment is not offered, 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.

D. CLINICAL FACULTY

The annual review process for clinical probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively.

In the penultimate year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, a formal performance review is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered reappointment. This review will utilize the same process as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the review dossier will include the clinical faculty member's (re)appointment letter, annual review letters, CV, and a summary document describing their accomplishments since the last appointment. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract. If reappointment is not offered, 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.

E. ASSOCIATED FACULTY

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

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

VI MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

Merit salary increases and other rewards made by a department must be made consistent with this document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the [College of Medicine](#), (2) the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), (3) the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and (4) the [Office of Human Resources](#).

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.

Meritorious performance in research, teaching, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for research funding will be the past 36

months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. The time frame for other research, teaching, and service performance will be the past 12 months. Only the published papers in the past 12 months will be counted, neither submitted papers nor papers in press will be counted. The quality of first author or senior author publication will be evaluated based on a journal's impact factor, and the relative ranking of the journals in biostatistics, bioinformatics, computer science, clinical informatics, and health outcome research respectively. The acceptance rate will be the criteria for the quality of conference papers. The number of submitted grants during the past 12 months will be another important criteria to assess a faculty's research activities. The PI and co-I statuses of these submitted grants shall follow the same criteria that form the basis for promotion consideration. 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

Each faculty member must undergo an annual review utilizing the principles outlined in Section V of this document. The department chair will compare the faculty member's performance to stated expectations and to those recorded in this document, and then determine an appropriate level of merit salary increase (if any). Other rewards will be determined in a similar manner. Final approval of salary increases is made by the Dean of the College of Medicine.

C. DOCUMENTATION

Documentation for the purposes of determining merit salary increases will use the same standards as are applied for considerations of promotion and/or tenure. These standards are described in Section VII of this document.

VII PROMOTION & TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A. CRITERIA

Outlined below are the department's formal criteria for academic advancement, including promotion and awarding of tenure.

In evaluating a candidate's qualifications in research, teaching, and service, reasonable flexibility will be exercised. As the College of Medicine diversifies and places new emphasis on interdisciplinary endeavors and program development, instances will arise in which the proper work of a faculty member may depart from established academic patterns, especially with regard to awarding tenure. Thus, care must be exercised to apply criteria flexibly, but without compromise in requiring the essential qualifications for promotion. Insistence upon this high standard for faculty is necessary for the maintenance and enhancement of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure, these positive attributes characterize the ability of a faculty member to effectively contribute to exemplary scholarship, teaching and service. A commitment to these values and principles can be demonstrated by constructive responses to and participation in university, college, and departmental initiatives. Examples include participation in faculty governance, outreach and service, ethical behavior, adherence to principles of responsible conduct of research, constructive conduct and behavior during the discharge of duties, responsibilities and authority, and the exercise of rights and privileges of a member of the faculty as reflected in the "Statement of Professional Ethics" of the American Association of University Professors.

On an annual basis, the OSU Office of Academic Affairs establishes specific guidelines, procedures, and schedules for the review of candidates for promotion and tenure. These guidelines, procedures, and schedules are to be adhered to by the department chair and the departmental AP&T committee.

1. **Tenure-track Faculty**

i. **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

The awarding of tenure is an acknowledgment of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It requires evidence of consistent achievement throughout the professional life of the faculty member. Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure occurs when a faculty member exhibits clear and sustained evidence of excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, as demonstrated by a national level of significance and recognition of scholarship. In addition, excellence in teaching and outstanding service to OSU is required (with external service recognized as appropriate for service relevant to the individual's area of scholarly focus), but alone is not sufficient for promotion and awarding of tenure. Excellence in teaching, scholarship and service is defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#). These three key achievements: scholarship, teaching, and service, are individually discussed below.

Achievement of a national reputation is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure. Objective examples of a national reputation include, but are not limited to service on NIH or equivalent grant review panels, participation on federal steering, guideline or advisory committees, selection for service in a national professional society, invitation for lectureships or scholarly reviews, receipt of national scientific awards, external letters of evaluation, and other measures of national impact.

Teaching: A distinctive record of teaching and mentoring excellence is required for promotion and tenure. Excellence is demonstrated by positive evaluations by students, fellows, local colleagues, and national peers. Teaching awards and other honors are also highly supportive of teaching excellence. A faculty member may also demonstrate a favorable impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, program or course development, and acquisition of a training program grant for either graduate training or post-doc fellow training.

Teaching excellence is most commonly demonstrated in this through evaluations and peer feedback based on presentations at other academic institutions, presentations or tutorials at scientific conferences or meetings, presentations at other medical centers or hospitals, and the like. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T- or K- awards for graduate students or postdoctoral fellows is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

Scholarship: Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. *A sustained record of both high quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an assistant professor is required for promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor.* Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings (i.e., papers and abstracts) that are relevant to the Biomedical Informatics domain. Such endeavors might include, but are not limited to, both the development and demonstration of foundational Biomedical Informatics or Biostatistics theories and methods, as well as the application of such theories and methods to drive biological, clinical, or health service problems. While individual circumstances may vary, both the quantity and quality of publications should be considered. We anticipate a tenure track faculty member ordinarily will publish approximately 20 papers since the appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor, in which the person serves as either the first author, or senior author, or corresponding author among substantial of these publications. We also anticipate that at least two papers whose impact factor scores are higher than 4, or their corresponding journal impact factors rank the top five in one of following fields: biostatistics, bioinformatics, computer science, clinical informatics, and health outcome research. The additional metrics that are useful in assessing a candidate include but are not limited to the total number of citations of their publications, the acceptance rate of conference proceedings, an individual's H-index. Such metrics should and must be considered in light of the norms and trends associated with the broad Biomedical Informatics domain, as well as the specific sub-domain of the field in which the individual focuses their scholarly activities. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued, especially to the extent that a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding; or the individual input of the faculty member as a middle author is uniquely contributory and clearly evident..

Evidence of sustained or multiple grant support is another crucial indicator of scholar success. Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must have obtained extramural funding as a principal investigator (PI) on an R01 or equivalent award from a federal agency (e.g. NIH, AHRQ, NSF, DOD, DOE) or have served as one of several program directors or principal investigators on a multiple-PD/PI award from a federal agency (such as a program/project type of award or cooperative agreement or R01), or have obtained a mid-career K award. They should ideally have demonstrated sustainability of their research program by renewal of an extramural award and/or by garnering a second distinct extramural grant and/or another nationally competitive, peer reviewed award or contract. The latter may include support from prominent national foundations, or a major industry or private sector funding agreement. In addition, serving as a PI or co-PI on a competitive, peer-reviewed contract from a federal funding agency, which provided for full facilities and administration costs, will be considered as being equivalent to the preceding grants or awards where such a contract is of greater or equal funding level.

As noted, faculty members are encouraged to collaborate with other investigators and are encouraged to meet the requirement for extramural funding support for their research as one of several program directors or principal investigators on multi-site or center grants or, in some circumstances, by serving as a co-investigator on multiple extramural awards.

Entrepreneurship is a special form of scholarship that is encouraged by the COM and Department of Biomedical Informatics. Entrepreneurship includes patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials transfers, technology commercialization, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements. Inasmuch as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, the College of Medicine and Department of Biomedical Informatics will analyze these flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenues should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards as co-PI, but not PIs. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion and tenure dossier.

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion and tenure decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements while a faculty member at The Ohio State University.

It should be appreciated that evidence of scholarship below the specified range does not preclude a positive promotion decision and that scholarship exceeding the specified range is not a guarantee of a positive tenure or promotion decision, especially if it occurs in isolation or in the context of poor performance in other areas.

Service: Service includes administrative service to OSU, the college, and the department, as well as professional service in the field of biomedical informatics professional or scientific societies, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Evidence of administrative service to OSU, the college, and the department include serving on the committees. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include severing on the journal editorial boards, serving as a reviewer for journals, and offices held and other service to local and national professional societies. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university includes serving as a: reviewer for funding proposals, external examiner, member of panels and commissions, professional consultant to industry, government, and education organization. Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

ii. Promotion to Professor

Awarding promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure must be based upon clear and unambiguous evidence that the candidate has a sustained, eminent record of achievement recognized nationally or internationally or has achieved positions of national leadership. The general criteria for promotion in scholarship, teaching and service require more advanced and sustained quantity, quality and impact than that required for promotion to Associate Professor. Importantly, the standard for external reputation is substantially more rigorous than for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. This record of excellence must be evident from activities undertaken and accomplishments achieved since being appointed or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor.

Scholarship: A sustained record of external funding and an enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an Associate Professor is required for promotion to Professor. Candidates for promotion to Professor should have published approximately 25 peer-reviewed journal, conference, or equivalent publications being considered as evidence of their scholarship since their promotion to Associate Professor. The person serves as either the first author, or senior author, or corresponding author among substantial of these publications. We also anticipate that at least three papers whose impact factor scores are higher than 4, or their corresponding journal impact factors rank the top five in one of following fields: biostatistics, bioinformatics, computer science, clinical informatics, and health outcome research.

Clear evidence of an international reputation or national leadership may include, but is not limited to: election to a leadership position in an international society or repetitive appointments to a national office, service as a national committee or task force chair, regular membership in or leadership of federal committees or working groups, regular membership on NIH, NSF or equivalent study sections, awards for research, and editorships in international journals. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program including sustained NIH or equivalent federal funding. At a minimum, candidates for promotion to Professor must be a PI or multiple-PD/PI on at least one NIH funded R01 or equivalent federal awards with a history of at least one competitive renewal and another nationally competitive grant, or have simultaneous funding on two NIH or equivalent awards.

Teaching and Mentoring: A record of teaching excellence as an Associate Professor must continue to justify promotion to the rank of Professor. Evidence for exemplary teaching includes outstanding student and peer evaluations, course or workshop leadership and design, a training program directorship, teaching awards, and organization of national course and curricula. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. Mentorship of junior faculty may also demonstrate teaching excellence. It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just ad hoc career coaching. Candidates should evidence mentoring relationships by providing mentees' evaluations. Leading NIH T32 or T15 training grant will be considered as strong evidence.

Service: Promotion to the rank of Professor requires service with distinction to the COM, OSU, and in national and international professional societies. Service includes administrative service to OSU, the College of Medicine, and the department, as well as professional service in the field of biomedical informatics professional or scientific societies, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. Evidence of administrative service to OSU, the College of Medicine, and the department include the leadership roles in the committees. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include severing on the journal editorships, and serving leadership roles to national and international professional societies. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university includes serving as a: regular member of panels and commissions for grant funding agencies, leading consultant to industry, government, and education organization.

2. **Research Faculty**

The criteria for promotion focus principally on the research productivity, and the standards are comparable to those used for the Tenure-track for each faculty rank.

i. **Promotion to Research Associate Professor**

For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of achievement in the areas of scholarship and service, as summarized below. Of note, particular emphasis is placed on achievement in support of interdisciplinary and team science for research faculty members. Achievement of a national reputation is an important factor for promotion to Associate Professor. Objective examples of a national reputation include service on, participation on federal steering, guideline or advisory committees, selection for service in a regional professional society, invitation to lectureships in academic conferences or academic institutions or scholarly reviews, external letters of evaluation, and other measures of national impact.

Scholarship: Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. *A sustained record of both high quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as a research assistant*

professor is required for promotion to the rank of research associate professor. Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings (i.e., papers and abstracts) that are relevant to the Biomedical Informatics domain. Such endeavors might include, but are not limited to, both the development and demonstration of foundational Biomedical Informatics and Biostatistics theories and methods, as well as the application of such theories and methods to driving biological, clinical, and health service problems. While individual circumstances may vary, both the quantity and quality of publications should be considered. We anticipate a candidate will publish approximately 20 papers since the appointment of Assistant Professor, in which the faculty member serves as either the first author, or senior author, or corresponding author on some of these publications. The additional metrics that are useful in assessing a candidate include the total number of citations of their publications, the impact factor of journals in which they have published, the acceptance rate of conference proceedings, and an individuals' H-index. Such metrics should and must be considered in light of the norms and trends associated with the broad Biomedical Informatics domain, as well as the specific sub-domain of the field in which the individual focuses their scholarly activities. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued, especially to the extent that a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding; or the individual input of the faculty member as a middle author is uniquely contributory and clearly evident.

Evidence of sustained or multiple grant support is another crucial indicator of scholar success. Candidates for promotion to Research Associate Professor must have obtained extramural funding as the Director of Biostatistics Core or Bioinformatics Core in a large funded program project, or lead the biostatistics or bioinformatics effort in a funded multi-institutional project from a federal agency (i.e., NIH, AHRQ, NSF, DOD, DOE); or serve as the PIs or one of multiple-PI/PD of a Data Coordinator Center funded by a federal agency. The candidates shall also serve as the co-investigator (co-I) on an R01 or equivalent award from a federal agency. The candidates are not expected to serve as either single PI or PI on a multiple-PD/PI award from a federal agency (such as a program/project type of award or cooperative agreement). In addition, serving as a PI or co-PI on a competitive, peer-reviewed contract from a federal funding agency, which provided for full facilities and administration costs, will be considered as being equivalent to the preceding grants or awards where such contract is of greater or equal funding level.

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements while a faculty member at The Ohio State University.

Service: Service includes administrative service to OSU, the College of Medicine, and the department, as well as professional service to the field of Biomedical Informatics via professional or scientific societies, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include serving as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications, and offices held and other service to local and national professional societies. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university includes serving as a: reviewer for funding proposals, external examiner, member of panels and commissions, professional consultant to industry, government, and education organization. Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

ii. Promotion to Research Professor

For promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of achievement in the areas of scholarship and service, including a significant growth in terms of the scope and impact of such activities since their promotion to Research Associate Professor, as summarized below. Of note, particular emphasis is placed on achievement in support of interdisciplinary and team science for research faculty members.

Scholarship: A sustained record of external funding and an enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as a Research Associate Professor is required for promotion to Research Professor. Candidates for promotion to Research Professor should have published approximately 25 peer-reviewed journal, conference, or equivalent publications being considered as evidence of their scholarship since their promotion to Research Associate Professor. Since that promotion, candidates shall be either first author, or senior author, or corresponding author on some of these publications. Clear evidence of an international

reputation including: election to a leadership position in an international society or repetitive appointments to a national office, service as a national committee or task force chair, membership in or leadership of federal committees or working groups, regular membership on NIH, NSF or equivalent study sections, peer recognition or awards for research, and editorships and lectures in international venues. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program including sustained NIH or equivalent federal funding.

Service: Promotion to the rank of Research Professor requires service with distinction to the COM, OSU, and in national and international professional societies. Service can include leadership roles on OSU committees, in professional organizations and journal editorships. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise could include service on panels and commissions, program development, and professional consultation to industry, government, and education.

3. Clinical Faculty

The criteria for promotion focus principally on the research productivity, and the standards are comparable to those used for the Tenure-track for each faculty rank.

i. Promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics on the Scholar pathway

For promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics on the Scholar pathway, a faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of achievement in the areas of scholarship and service, as summarized below. Of note, particular emphasis is placed on achievement in support of interdisciplinary and team science for clinical faculty members. Achievement of a national reputation is an important factor for promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics. Objective examples of a national reputation include service on NIH or equivalent grant review panels, participation on federal steering, guideline or advisory committees, selection for service in a national professional society, invitation to lecture in academic conferences or institutions or scholarly reviews, receipt of national scientific awards, external letters of evaluation, and other measures of national impact.

Scholarship: Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. *A sustained record of both high quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an assistant professor is required for promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor.* Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings (i.e., papers and abstracts) that are relevant to the Biostatistics or Biomedical Informatics domains. Such endeavors might include, but are not limited to, both the development and demonstration of foundational Biomedical Informatics or Biostatistics theories and methods, as well as the application of such theories and methods to driving biological and clinical problems. While individual circumstances may vary, both the quantity and quality of publications should be considered. We anticipate a candidate will publish approximately 20 papers since the appointment of Assistant Professor, in which the faculty serves as either the first author, or senior author, or corresponding author on some of these publications. The additional metrics that are useful in assessing a candidate include the total number of citations of their publications, the impact factor of journals in which they have published, the acceptance rate of conference proceedings, and an individuals' H-index. Such metrics should and must be considered in light of the norms and trends associated with the broad Biomedical Informatics or Biostatistics domains, as well as the specific sub-domain of the field in which the individual focuses their scholarly activities. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued, especially to the extent that a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding; or the individual input of the faculty member as a middle author is uniquely contributory and clearly evident.

Evidence of sustained or multiple grant support is another potential indicator of scholar success. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics must have obtained extramural or intramural funding as a co- investigator (co-I). They should ideally have demonstrated sustainability of their funding level by service and consultation support obtained via service line chargeback mechanisms and contracts with other departments or extramural or intramural funded projects.

Entrepreneurship is a special form of scholarship valued by the COM and Department of Biomedical Informatics. Entrepreneurship includes patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development,

and materials transfers, technology commercialization, formation of startup companies and licensing and option agreements. In as much as there are no expressly defined metrics for entrepreneurship, the College of Medicine and department will analyze these flexibly. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenues should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact. These entrepreneurial activities will be recognized as scholarly or service activities in the promotion dossier.

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements while a faculty member at The Ohio State University.

Service: Service includes administrative service to OSU, the College of Medicine, and the department, as well as professional service to the field of biomedical informatics or biostatistics via professional or scientific societies, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include serving as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications, and offices held and other service to local and national professional societies. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university includes serving as a: reviewer for funding proposals, external examiner, member of panels and commissions, professional consultant to industry, government, and education organization. Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

ii. Promotion to Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics on the Scholar pathway

For promotion to Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics on the Scholar pathway, a faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of achievement in the areas of scholarship and service, including a significant growth in terms of the scope and impact of such activities since their promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics, as summarized below. Of note, particular emphasis is placed on achievement in support of interdisciplinary and team science for clinical faculty members.

Scholarship: A sustained record of external funding and an enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as a Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics is required for promotion to Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics. Candidates for promotion to Professor should have published approximately 25 peer-reviewed journal, conference, or equivalent publications being considered as evidence of their scholarship since their promotion to Associate Professor. Since that promotion, candidates shall be either first author, or senior author, or corresponding author on some of these publications. Clear evidence of a national reputation including: election to a position in a national society or repetitive appointments to a national office, service as a national committee or task force chair, membership in or leadership of federal committees or working groups, regular membership on NIH, NSF or equivalent study sections. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained funding as co-investigators on studies, or funding obtained through contracts with departments and/or salary recovery via chargeback mechanisms.

Service: Promotion to the rank of Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics requires service with distinction to the COM, OSU, and in national and international professional societies. Service can include leadership roles on OSU committees, in professional organizations and journal editorships. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise could include service on panels and commissions, program development, and professional consultation to industry, government, and education.

iii. Promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics on the Educator pathway

For promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics on the Educator pathway, a faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of achievement in the areas of scholarship and education and service, as summarized below. Of note, particular emphasis is placed on achievement in support of interdisciplinary and team science for clinical faculty members. Achievement of a national reputation is an important factor for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. Objective examples of a

national reputation include service on NIH or equivalent grant review panels, participation on federal steering, guideline or advisory committees, selection for service in a national professional society, invitation for lectureships in academic conferences or academic institutions or scholarly reviews, receipt of national scientific awards, external letters of evaluation, and other measures of national impact.

Scholarship: Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. *A sustained record of both high quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an Assistant Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics is required for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics or Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics.* Achievement of excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by discovery of a substantial body of original knowledge that is published in high quality peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings (i.e., papers and abstracts) that are relevant to the Biostatistics or Biomedical Informatics domains. Such endeavors might include, but are not limited to, both the development and demonstration of foundational Biomedical Informatics or Biostatistics theories and methods, novel training program development in biomedical informatics, and the application of such theories and methods to driving biological and clinical problems. While individual circumstances may vary, both the quantity and quality of publications should be considered. We anticipate a candidate will publish approximately 15 papers since the appointment to the Assistant Professor, in which the faculty member serves as either first author, or senior author, or corresponding author on some of these publications. The additional metrics that are useful in assessing a candidate include the total number of citations of their publications, the impact factor of journals in which they have published, the acceptance rate of conference proceedings, and an individual's H-index. Such metrics should and must be considered in light of the norms and trends associated with the broad Biomedical Informatics or Biostatistics domains, as well as the specific sub-domain of the field in which the individual focuses their scholarly activities. Participation in collaborative, multidisciplinary research and team science is highly valued, especially to the extent that a faculty member's record of collaborative scholarship includes manuscripts on which authorship is first, senior, or corresponding; or the individual input of the faculty member as a middle author is uniquely contributory and clearly evident.

Evidence of sustained or multiple grant support is another potential indicator of scholar success. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics must have obtained extramural or intramural funding as a co-investigator (co-I).

Although the total body of scholarship over the course of a career is considered in promotion decisions, the highest priority is placed on scholarly achievements while a faculty member at The Ohio State University.

Teaching: A distinctive record of teaching and mentoring excellence is required for promotion. Excellence is demonstrated by certification training program, and undergraduate and graduate program development; positive evaluations by students, fellows, local colleagues, and national peers. Teaching awards and other honors are also highly supportive of teaching excellence. A faculty member may also demonstrate a favorable impact on teaching and training programs, including curricular innovation, new teaching modalities or methods of evaluating teaching, program or course development, and acquisition of the training program grant for either graduate training or post-doc fellow training. They should ideally have demonstrated sustainability of their funding level by teaching obtained via the tuition recovery.

Teaching excellence is most commonly demonstrated in this through evaluations and peer feedback based on presentations at other academic institutions, presentations or tutorials at scientific conferences or meetings, presentations at other medical centers or hospitals, and the like. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T- or K- awards for graduate students or postdoctoral fellows is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

Service: Service includes administrative service to OSU, the College of Medicine, and the department, as well as professional service to the field of Biomedical Informatics or Biostatistics via professional or scientific societies, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include journal editorships, serving as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications, and offices held and other service to local and national professional societies. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university includes serving as a: reviewer for funding proposals, external examiner, member of panels and commissions, professional consultant to industry, government,

and education organization. Professional expertise provided as compensated outside professional consultation alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

iv. Promotion to Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics on the Educator pathway

For promotion to Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics on the Educator pathway, a faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of achievement in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service, including a significant growth in terms of the scope and impact of such activities since their promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics, as summarized below. Of note, particular emphasis is placed on achievement in support of interdisciplinary and team science for clinical faculty members.

Scholarship: A sustained record of external funding and an enhanced quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as an Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics is required for promotion to Clinical Professor. Candidates for promotion to Professor should have published approximately 20 peer-reviewed journal, conference, or equivalent publications being considered as evidence of their scholarship since their promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics. Since that promotion, candidates shall be either the first author, or senior author, or corresponding author on some of these publications. Clear evidence of a national reputation including: election to a position in a national society or repetitive appointments to a national office, service as a national committee or task force chair, membership in or leadership of federal committees or working groups, regular membership on NIH, NSF or equivalent study sections.

Teaching and Mentoring: A record of teaching excellence as an Associate Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics must continue to justify promotion to the rank of Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics. Evidence for exemplary teaching includes outstanding student and peer evaluations, certification training program, and undergraduate and graduate program development; course or workshop leadership and design, a training program directorship, teaching awards, and organization of national course and curricula. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. Mentorship of junior faculty may also demonstrate teaching excellence. It is presumed that this will take the form of a primary mentoring relationship, and not just ad hoc career coaching. Candidates should evidence mentoring relationships by providing mentees' evaluations. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have developed and maintained funding obtained through contracts with departments and/or salary recovery via tuition recovery.

Service: Promotion to the rank of Professor of Clinical Biomedical Informatics requires service with distinction to the COM, OSU, and in national and international professional societies. Service can include leadership roles on OSU committees, in professional organizations and journal editorships. Evidence of the provision of professional expertise could include service on panels and commissions, program development, and professional consultation to industry, government, and education.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty members are not eligible for tenure and are normally reappointed annually, unless otherwise specified in their appointment letter. Associated faculty members are expected to make recognized contributions to scholarship in the field of biomedical informatics and will be evaluated using the same criteria as faculty on the **Tenure-track**. Reappointment will be based on documented sustained contributions to the department and the field of biomedical informatics.

B. PROCEDURES

1. General

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found at <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>. The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party in the review process, apply to all faculty in the department. Appendix A of this document contains a Promotion Review Workflow to assist in understanding the steps of the review process.

2. Annual Guidelines by the OAA

Annually, the Office of Academic Affairs establishes the specific guidelines, procedures, and schedules for the review of promotion and tenure candidates. This document is forwarded to the department chair. Upon receipt of this document, all department faculty eligible for promotion, promotion and tenure, or reappointment will be forwarded a copy.

3. Review of Eligible Candidates

All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed by:

1. Eligible faculty
2. The chair of their department and
3. At the college and university level

Notification of Eligibility

The department chair will forward a copy of the specific guidelines, procedures and schedules received from the OAA to all faculty eligible for promotion, promotion and tenure, or reappointment. The review for tenure during the final year of a probationary period is mandatory and must take place.

A faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the department Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee may not deny a faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.

4. Candidate Responsibilities

The candidate will have primary responsibility for preparing, according to Office of Academic Affairs guidelines, a dossier documenting his or her accomplishments. In the College of Medicine, all dossiers must be prepared using electronic expertise profiling tools as designated by the Office of Academic Affairs. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist. Additionally, it is the requirement of each candidate to select four peer-reviewed journal articles from their overall body of work that are representative of the research by the candidate. These will be included as an appendix to the dossier.

The candidate must also submit a copy of the department's APT Document that was in effect at the time of the candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

If external evaluations are required candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair or his or her designee and the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

5. Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee

Committee Chair's Responsibilities:

- a. To gather internal evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service from students and peers, as appropriate.
- b. To obtain letters from external evaluators, and from other departments at this University in which the candidate has an appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not.

- c. To call meetings with due notice to members

Committee's Responsibilities:

- a. To review the AP&T document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- b. To consider annually, per the schedules and deadlines established by the Office of Academic Affairs and College of Medicine, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. A simple 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 dossier and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- c. A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- d. Annually, per the schedules and deadlines established by the Office of Academic Affairs and College of Medicine, provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
- Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
 - Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
 - Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department.

6. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- a. Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- b. To gather internal evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service from students and peers, as appropriate.
- c. To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the chair and the candidate, in conjunction with the committee chair. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- d. To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- d. To remove any member of the Committee 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. To attend the meetings of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
- f. To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- g. To meet with the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to discuss any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the Committee, if the Committee requests such a meeting.
- h. To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and department chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- i. To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- j. To forward the completed dossier to the College of Medicine, per published deadlines, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- k. To receive the Committee of the Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.
- l. To inform the candidate in writing of the Executive Vice President and Provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the Board of Trustees (if positive).

7. External and Internal Evaluations

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. 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 research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, 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. This department will give preference to evaluations from full professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State, but will consider evaluations from well-established and highly qualified associate professors for candidates seeking promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring term prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests. ***It is important to note that a non-response by an individual who is requested to provide such a letter, or declination of that request, shall not be considered to pejorative relative to the proceedings of a given appointment, tenure, and/or promotion case.***

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/Letter201.pdf>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

8. Verification of Citations in Dossier

The Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be responsible for verifying the accuracy of citations in each candidate's dossier. A signed statement confirming the accuracy of these citations shall be placed in the candidate's dossier.

9. Objectivity of the Process

The department, at each step of the review process, shall conduct its activities in an impartial fashion. The intent of the review process is to produce the highest quality faculty, with the greatest potential for substantial contributions to the field. In the interest of achieving this goal, the eligible faculty's role is one of independent and objective evaluators of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, not one of advocacy. Concerns or factors beyond those articulated in this document are not to be considered or used in the decision-making processes of this committee. The credibility of the department rests in the objectivity of its actions and the adherence to its carefully defined standards and principles.

C. DOCUMENTATION

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline and applicable guidelines and/or standards as published by that office. While the

Appointments, Promotion & Tenure Committee Chair, or his or her designee, checks the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier completed by the candidate.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or some other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication. Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations for purposes of the review.

1. Teaching

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. Examples of documentation include:

- Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports for every class.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports.
- References to pedagogical papers, books, and other materials published or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication, but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching.

2. Research

The total body of scholarship over the course of a career is included in the dossier for probationary faculty, with the highest priority placed on scholarly achievements while a faculty member is at The Ohio State University. For tenured or nonprobatoinary faculty it is the date of hire or last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include:

- References to scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received.
- Other relevant documentation of research (e.g., published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

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 last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include:

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
 - clinical services
 - administrative service to department
 - administrative service to college
 - administrative service to university and Student Life
 - advising to student groups and organizations
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department

- any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

VIII APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>). This rule requires candidates who believe they have been improperly evaluated to seek to resolve the matter informally before filing a formal appeal.

Faculty members in the department who wish to appeal a non-renewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision can do so only after the Executive Vice President and Provost has rendered a decision. Faculty must appeal in writing within one month of receipt of notification of the decision.

Note that this is separate from the comments process reviewed earlier in this document. The comments process provides an opportunity for a faculty member to raise issues while the review is in process, whereas the appeal is based on the faculty member's contention that a final decision was based upon improper evaluation. The appeal letter must reference the policies and standards in question and provide the faculty member's evidence for disputing the university's decision.

IX SEVENTH YEAR REVIEW

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth the conditions and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year, mandatory tenure, review. If a faculty seventh year review is conducted by the department, it will be made consistent with the college AP&T document and other relevant policies, procedures, and practices established by: 1) the college; 2) the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); 3) the Office of Academic Affairs, including the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and procedures Handbook](#); and 4) the Office of Human Resources.

X PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

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

Systematic peer evaluation of teaching is required. Probationary, tenure track and clinical-educator faculty (at all ranks) must have periodic peer evaluations of classroom teaching. The evaluations should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot validly assess, such as appropriateness of curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials, and consistency with the highest standards of disciplinary knowledge. Literature on the evaluation of instruction suggests that there is no single best instructional method. Peer evaluations should have clear goals and reflect the department's criteria for good teaching. Peer review evaluations are completed in letter form, samples are available from the department upon request. 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.

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

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

At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Promotion Review Workflow (Final Year of Probationary Period)

