

Department of Neuroscience

Appointments, Promotion and Tenure

Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Neuroscience

Original version: 9/7/99

Revised 11/17/99

Revised 10/3/01/NS/Admn/Neuro AP & T Guidelines

Revised 04/21/05/NS/Admn/2005 AP & T Guidelines

Revised 05/02/05/NS/Admin/NeuroAP & T Guidelines 2005; Approved by OAA 5/16/05

Revised 03/22/06/NS/Admin/NeuroAP & T Guidelines 2006; OAA Approved 5/16/06

Revised per OAA 09/14/07

Revised 11/10/10

Revised 4/30/11

Revised 9/6/11

Revised 5/30/12

Revised 06/12/12/Admin/NeuroAP & T Guidelines 2012

Revised 9/6/13; OAA Approved 9/13/13.

Last Revised and approved by the Faculty: March 19, 2019; OAA Approved July 18, 2019

Table of Contents

Appointments	4
- <i>Criteria</i> -	
Research Faculty	4
Associated Faculty	5
Courtesy Appointments	5
- <i>Procedures</i> -	
Research Faculty	6
Courtesy and Emeritus Appointments	6
Annual Review Procedures	6
Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	9
Research Output and Impact	9
Research Funding	10
Teaching or Instructional Activity	10
Service	10
Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	11
Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty.....	11
Promotion to Professor.....	15
Promotion of Research Faculty.....	17
Appendix	18

In 2019, the Department of Neuroscience (DNS) faculty approved using the [College of Medicine's \(CoM\) Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure \(APT\) Document](#) as the primary resource for guiding decisions related to appointments, promotion and tenure in the Department of Neuroscience.

However, several department-specific supplements to the CoM APT document, that were also part of the Department's 2013 revised APT document, were maintained and approved by DNS faculty. Specific supplements to the CoM APT document include:

Appointments

Criteria

Research Faculty:

Research faculty members are those who focus principally on scholarship. Although the standards are similar to those used for the Tenure Track for each faculty rank, overall expectations for research output are higher since 100% of effort for research faculty members is devoted to research. A Research Faculty member may, in consultation with the departmental Chair, participate in limited educational and service activities. Research faculty members are expected to contribute to a Department's research mission and are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected by high quality peer-reviewed publications and successful competition for NIH or similar funding.

Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality and impact of research in the Department. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the Tenure Track faculty, Research Faculty must comprise no more than thirty-three per cent of the number of Tenure Track faculty in the Department. In all cases, however, the number of Research faculty positions must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in the Department. Contracts will be for a period of at least one year and for no more than five years, and must explicitly state the expectations for salary support. In general, research faculty appointments will require 100% salary recovery. It is expected that salary recovery will be entirely derived from extramural funds. The initial contract is probationary, and a faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

Research faculty 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. Within the Department of Neuroscience, Research faculty may be appointed at the discretion of the Chair to no more than one standing or ad-hoc committee, with the exception of the Advisory Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. Research faculty are not eligible for this committee and also are not able to vote on curricular issues or promotion and/or tenure for tenure-track faculty, regardless of rank.

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the TIU.

For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested. Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor require prior approval of the College of Medicine and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

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

Courtesy Appointments: In an effort to enhance the value of a courtesy appointment in the Department of Neuroscience (“*Department*”), the Department has voted to change the guideline regarding courtesy appointments. It is now expected that an individual seeking or currently holding a courtesy appointment in the *Department* will make substantive contributions to the *Department* mission, as stated in its Patterns of Administration. There are many ways that a courtesy faculty member can contribute to the *Department* including:

1. Establishing a collaboration with a member of the *Department* that results in publications or grant submissions that include both the faculty member with the courtesy appointment and the faculty member for which the *Department* is their TIU.
2. Develop new courses in the *Department* or provide one or more lectures in graduate/undergraduate courses that are led by a TIU faculty member in the *Department*.
3. Serve on ad-hoc *Department* committees (e.g., search committees for new faculty).
4. Serve as an active mentor for junior faculty members in the *Department*.

This is not a comprehensive list and whether a faculty member is granted or continues to hold a

courtesy appointment will ultimately be determined by a vote of the *Department* faculty. A majority vote is required before new courtesy appointments are approved or renewed.

In addition, there are specific expectations for expenditure and award allocations on the PA005 form for courtesy faculty members.

- When a courtesy faculty member submits a grant application that involves a collaboration with a *Department* faculty member, the % **award allocation** must at least match the %FTE that is committed to the budget (e.g., 5% FTE for Dr. X = minimum of 5% award allocation). If more than one faculty member in the *Department* is involved, the award allocation should reflect the sum of their %FTE.
- **Expenditure allocations** will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis and should be commensurate with use or need of *Department* space, equipment and/or administration as described in the grant proposal.

Courtesy appointments will be reviewed every 3 years by the *Department*. For faculty members that are not meeting the above criteria, their courtesy appointment may be terminated (with notice).

In order to request or renew a courtesy appointment in the *Department*, faculty should send a brief letter/email to the Chair explaining why s/he wants a courtesy appointment and how s/he will contribute to the *Department*.

The letter should also state that s/he agrees to follow the Department of Neuroscience Guideline on Courtesy Appointments.

Procedures

Research Faculty: Initial appointment reviews of Research Faculty will be conducted using guidelines described above. Before the department Chair calls a vote of the eligible faculty regarding appointment of a prospective research faculty member, every effort will be made to have the candidate meet with departmental faculty and present a research seminar. However, under extenuating circumstances the seminar can be replaced with (1) one-on-one or group meetings between the candidate and a group of eligible faculty, either in person or via phone/internet or (2) a chalk-talk to a group of eligible faculty. To facilitate the review of research faculty candidates, the candidate should provide a research summary statement and an updated CV to the eligible faculty.

Courtesy and Emeritus Appointments: Courtesy appointments will be considered as described above. For Emeritus appointments in the Department of Neuroscience, the Chair may request input from the APT Committee regarding Emeritus recommendations. The evaluation for appointment to Emeritus status should encompass the overall contributions of the faculty member to his/her field of study, to teaching and in the area of service as well as contributions to the Department, College, University and community. The APT Committee may request documentation to facilitate evaluation from the candidate and from any other source deemed appropriate.

Annual Review Procedures

Mandatory Mentoring Committee Meetings	APT Committee Meeting	Meeting with Chair/Merit Review
Oct-Nov	Dec-Feb	May-Jul

In the Department of Neuroscience, all probationary faculty and Associate Professors must complete a mandatory annual review with his/her mentoring committee in *Oct-Nov* each year. The intent of the mentoring committee meetings is to assess progress of the faculty member toward promotion or promotion and tenure. Mentoring committee expectations are outlined in the Department of Neuroscience *Patterns of Administration* document.

Reports from Faculty Members

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide current materials for review each year. These will include an updated faculty spreadsheet that summarizes annual research, teaching and service activities, an updated curriculum vita and a one-page narrative that describes your research output and impact, research funding, teaching and service activities for the year in review. The goal of the narrative is to capture important facts and subtleties that cannot be captured with numbers in the faculty spreadsheet. This narrative should also include your goals in each mission area and a brief description of how you see yourself fitting into the Department, College, University and your chosen field of research.

The APT committee will meet soon after, but no later than Jan-Feb of the following year, to review all probationary faculty and Associate Professors. The APT committee review is based on the faculty member's current dossier and/or curriculum vitae, advisory letter from the faculty member's mentoring committee, as well as any other material deemed appropriate by the faculty member, or any additional material requested by the committee. In addition, all student evaluation of instruction (SEI) reports and peer evaluations should be included. The goal of the annual review by the APT committee is to recognize areas of accomplishment and to identify areas in which improvement is needed. In the event that a probationary faculty member's progress is deemed to be less than satisfactory, the committee will consider the factors that have contributed to the insufficient progress. Where appropriate, the committee may recommend that the faculty member consider applying for exclusion of time from the probationary period according to the provision of **Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(D)**. In order to avoid conflicting advice regarding the academic progress of a probationary faculty member, the Chair of the APT Committee will confer with the department Chair. In the event of a divergence of opinion regarding the assessment of a faculty member, the Chair will meet with the committee to discuss and resolve areas of disagreement. Probationary faculty whose annual review indicates a low probability of ultimately meeting expectations for promotion and tenure will be so advised by the Chair, and a recommendation for non-renewal of the appointment will be made. A recommendation from the Chair to not reappoint a faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures as detailed in the University's Faculty Annual Review Policy, <https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>. See also ***Probationary Tenure Track Faculty. Fourth-Year Review*** below.

Approximately three months after the APT annual review meeting, the Chair or his/her designee will conduct an annual review of all faculty (probationary faculty and tenured Associate Professors and Professors) to assess progress and to discuss professional goals and development. These reviews will usually take place in Summer (*May-July*) and will also include a merit review. All faculty members should prepare documentation as outlined in the *Faculty Checklist for Annual Review* (Appendix). The following is an example workflow for the annual

review process:

- Beginning in May of each year, faculty will submit the review materials outlined in the “*Faculty Checklist for Annual Review*” (see Appendix).
- The department Chair will begin reviewing materials in *May*.
- Based on the submitted review materials, an annual review letter will be drafted in advance of scheduled review meetings with each faculty member. For probationary faculty and Associate Professors, feedback from the APT committee will also be considered in drafting the final annual review letter.
- The annual review letter will be discussed in a one-on-one meeting between the faculty member and the Chair (*June-July*).
- Annual review letters will be revised after discussion with the faculty member and will include final ratings or scores (0-3; see *Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards*, below) for the faculty member’s performance in research output, research impact, research funding, teaching and service. These scores will be used to determine merit salary raises (if applicable) (see also *Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards*, below).
- Final letters will be returned to faculty, usually in *August-September*.

Discussion during the annual review meeting with the Chair will focus on research, teaching, and service activity in the current year, but to ensure that trends in productivity, or lack thereof, are not overlooked, a discussion of the previous two years’ activity and comments of the APT Committee from the previous two years also will be included. The annual review will also include discussion of current space assignments, direct appointment salary recovery and appropriate alignment of time commitments across the research, teaching and service mission areas.

Probationary Tenure Track Faculty. Fourth-Year Review: In the Department of Neuroscience, the Fourth-Year Review requires that the APT Committee present the case of the probationary faculty, pro and con, to the *eligible faculty* in the Department (i.e., tenured TIU faculty at a higher rank than the candidate). External evaluations are only solicited when either the department Chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are needed to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate’s scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. After the meeting of the eligible faculty, a report of the faculty assessment, prepared by the Chair of the APT Committee, including the numerical vote, obtained by secret ballot, is forwarded to the department Chair. The department Chair will prepare an independent written assessment of the case and a recommendation to the Dean. The report of the faculty assessment and the department Chair’s letter will be made available to the candidate, who may respond in writing. The Chair of the APT Committee and/or the department Chair may provide a written response to any comments made by the candidate for inclusion in the packet that is sent to the Dean.

Research Faculty: The annual review process for research 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 proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of the contract. If a research faculty member was reappointed after a formal review process during the initial probationary term (contract), all future reappointment decisions can be made by the Department Chair, without the need for formal review by the eligible faculty.

Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

Merit reviews will be conducted as part of the annual review (see above, *Annual Review Procedures*). Consistent with the mission of the Department of Neuroscience, recommendations for merit salary increases will be based upon an evaluation of performance in the following three mission areas: research/scholarship (research output and research impact), teaching and service.

It is the responsibility of the Chair, in consultation with each faculty member, to assign individual workloads to each faculty member to ensure that the three mission areas of the department are fulfilled. Given the individual circumstances of the faculty, the proportion of time devoted to scholarship, teaching and service will vary between faculty. Salary and merit raises (if any) will be based on a composite ranking across these mission areas, taking into consideration the unique workload of the individual faculty member. Deviation from the average workload in any one of these three activities will be balanced through adjustments in the other areas. The Chair, in consultation with the individual faculty member, will make these adjustments.

Productivity is the primary factor in determining salary and merit raises. Each year, the following rating scale will be used to score a faculty member's performance in research output, research impact, research funding, teaching and service.

- 0.0 – no significant activity in mission area
- 1.0 – productivity below expectations
- 1.5 – meets expectations with some room for improvement
- 2.0 – meets expectations
- 2.5 – meets expectations with some demonstration of excellence
- 3.0 – exceeds expectations

Research Output and Impact

The following represent minimum or baseline metrics that, if met, would constitute an average rating of 2.0 (i.e., meets expectations) for research output and impact. These annual baseline metrics follow the criteria for *Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews* section (starting on page 11) of this document. However, all faculty, especially tenure-track Assistant and Associate Professors, should regularly review and refer to the *Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews* section of this A,P &T document and also feedback from their mentoring committees and the A,P&T committee when setting goals and evaluating annual progress towards promotion/promotion and tenure.

- Publish at least 1 peer-review manuscript as first or senior author
- Publish at least 2 peer-reviewed manuscripts as a co-author
- Provide evidence that additional publications and grant proposals are in development. This can be achieved by charting “soft” research metrics in the **Annual Review table** (e.g., abstracts submitted to scientific conferences, invention disclosures and patent applications, development of new collaborations) and also in the **required one page narrative** that each faculty member will provide in advance of the annual review.
- Present your data at research conferences or invited lectures/seminars
- Provide peer reviews for journals, foundations, government funding agencies, etc.
- Provide evidence that awareness of your research is growing (e.g., document the

number of citations to your research publications year over year, participate in research communication by promoting your published research through media relations, etc.)

In your narrative, you should include other examples of how your research impact is growing; however, since many of the examples below are beyond the immediate control of the faculty member these items are not expected of all faculty.

- Provide examples of how your research has influenced or shaped public or government policy, research trends or public perception or scientific understanding
- Participate as a stakeholder or content advisor for any University, national or international committee or organization (e.g., serve on advisory panels)
- List awards or any other formal recognition of excellence
- Acquire funding via philanthropy or via industry partnerships

Research Funding

The following represent minimum or baseline metrics that, if met, would constitute an average rating of 2.0 (i.e., meets expectations) for research funding.

- Achieve a **minimum** of 50% direct salary appointment to extramural grants
- If not meeting 50% salary recovery, submit at least one grant proposal as PI or co-I with salary recovery
- Document progress on the development or submission of at least one additional new grant proposal (use narrative to explain)

Teaching or Instructional Activity

Evaluation of teaching and instructional activity will be based upon the quantity and the quality of teaching, taking into account the average percentage of time devoted to teaching or instructional activities relative to other mission areas. Quantity will be measured in part by the number of formal lectures given by a faculty member. Other examples of teaching or instructional activity that will be considered include: 1) serving as course director, 2) serving as major/permanent research advisor to graduate students, 3) participating in special graduate activities such as laboratories and student rotations, 4) participating as a member of qualifying, general and final examination committees and 5) advising professional and/or undergraduate student research. The quality of teaching will be assessed by means of student evaluation of instruction (SEI) and documented peer review letters.

Service

Service activity includes administrative work (e.g., for department, college, university), service to the profession (e.g., reviewing grants and manuscripts, serving as an officer for professional organizations), and service to the community (e.g., local, state, national, or international). Serving as a formal advisor or mentor to junior or mid-career faculty may also be considered as service to the Department, College or University. Service activity also includes heading teaching units and directing facilities or centers. Faculty members are expected to participate in both departmental and college governance. The average percentage of time a faculty member devotes to service activities will vary. As service activities tend to increase with seniority, the evaluation of service activities will be based upon the quantity and relative impact of the service

then weighted, taking into account the average percentage of time devoted to other mission areas. To assist in the evaluation process, total time spent on service activities should be estimated using the *Service Time Allocations Guidelines* (see Appendix).

Procedures

Based on the documentation provided by faculty members (see *Faculty Checklist for Annual Review* in Appendix), a merit score of 0-3 will be assigned by the department Chair in each of the four categories outlined above to arrive at an average score. Faculty members will receive a copy of the range of all faculty scores. If the faculty member fails to provide sufficient documentation to allow an informed evaluation of their performance, there will be no basis for recommending a merit increase.

In order to provide flexibility for dealing with funding realities and emerging salary inequities, the Chair will evaluate each faculty member from the viewpoint of salary equity relative to the overall performances and salaries of others in the same rank in the department and other basic science departments in the College of Medicine. If the Chair believes that an inequity exists, s/he will recommend a salary equity adjustment to the Dean.

Documentation

A draft of the annual review letter with merit recommendation will be prepared in advance of a faculty member's annual review meeting. This letter will be revised after discussion with the faculty member and will include final performance scores as well as a summary discussion of goals for the upcoming year and an agreed upon workload across the three mission areas.

Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

The following metrics for promotion and/or tenure were proposed by the Department of Neuroscience faculty to replace or supplement the Criteria, Procedures and Documentation sections of *Section VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews* in the approved College of Medicine APT document. If not mentioned below, faculty members should default to the approved [College of Medicine's \(CoM\) Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure \(APT\) Document](#).

Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

Associate Professor with Tenure

Scholarship. Scholarship is broadly defined as the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. The awarding of promotions with tenure is an acknowledgment of excellence and future potential for preeminence. 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 that is published in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or proceedings, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in one's field of endeavor.

Achievement of a national reputation is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure. Evaluation of research excellence will take into consideration the faculty member's workload agreement and the assigned research duties of the candidate. First and

foremost, promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires excellence and demonstration of significant impact of the faculty member's research. Impact is the single most important criterion for promotion and is determined primarily by high quality research; however, quantity is not unimportant. Excellence is defined here as the attainment of high standards of quality and sufficient quantity of research activities to constitute a substantial contribution to the candidate's field. There are many indicators of excellence and impact. Indicators used by the APT Committee to make judgments include:

- *Achievement of National Recognition and Scientific Impact on the Field:* There are several measures that will be considered as evidence of having scientific impact: (a) Publication as first or senior author in journals that are deemed by experts in the field to be of excellent quality with rigorous review criteria; (b) citation rates (the number of times a paper has been cited by other publications); (c) the candidate's h-index or i10 index (potentially more useful for junior faculty); (d) invitations to speak at national and international meetings; (e) appointment to editorial boards; (f) invitations to write review articles; (g) participation on steering, guideline, or advisory committees of national organizations; (h) invitations to serve on grant review panels, and (i) receipt of national scientific awards. Successful promotion *will require the demonstration of impact, not just the potential for impact*. For example, publishing a single paper in a high-impact journal or receiving a single grant are indications of potential for impact, not necessarily impact *per se*. ***Demonstration of impact and a national reputation is a prerequisite for promotion to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure.***
- *Letters from external evaluators.* These should be from senior scientists, normally at or above the rank of Associate Professor, that are familiar with the candidate's field(s) of research and who are qualified to assess the importance and quality of his/her research program and its published results. The guidelines for soliciting these letters are the same as described in the College of Medicine Document.
- *Publications.* Publications represent the archival results of the faculty member's research program, both before and since their appointment in the Department, and they play a critical role in promotion and tenure review. If a former mentor is retained as an author on the candidate's papers beyond the first 2 years of faculty appointment, the reason must be clearly stated; otherwise it will be difficult to determine whether the candidate was able to develop an independent scientific career.

It is expected that faculty members will publish annually. The primary metric for evaluating publication records will be to determine whether the faculty member has established a consistent pattern of high-quality publications resulting from work primarily conducted in the candidate's laboratory since joining Ohio State as a faculty member. These papers should be published in recognized, peer-reviewed journals. It is expected that independent, first and/or senior author publications or co-corresponding authors will constitute a substantial portion of the publication list. However, it is important to form collaborations. For promotion to Associate Professor, successful candidates would generally have a career total of 25-35 publications. Candidates are expected to publish 1-2 first or senior author papers per year and contribute as a collaborator author on 1-2 additional manuscripts. This would result in ~18-25 publications generated at The Ohio State University. These ranges are in line with those described as baseline metrics under *Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards* and are intended as general guidelines; however, it is expected that faculty will be on a trajectory to meet or exceed these publication requirements at the time of promotion.

Review articles may form a portion of the publication list and may be used to indicate that a faculty member is considered to be an expert in the field; however, a successful dossier will contain mostly (>80%) peer-reviewed research articles. Book chapters or reviews alone or in majority will not be sufficient for promotion.

The candidate's citation rate will be documented and verified by the Procedure Oversight Designee (POD); the dossier will contain a citation table that indicates the number of citations for individual papers published at The Ohio State University and an overall career citation index. It is recognized that the citation rate for papers published within 1 or 2 years before review for Promotion and Tenure is initiated may be low due to the short time the work has been available. However, evidence that the work is well-received would be supportive of the impact of the work, and would commonly be documented in external letters of evaluation and by other common publicizing vehicles including high Altmetric scores, media coverage, Editorial highlights, etc.

Productivity that exceeds the publishing guidelines presented above does not guarantee a positive promotion and tenure recommendation *if* the eligible faculty and professional peers do not consider the research to be of high quality or impact; thus, it is not advisable to publish the smallest quanta of data to enhance publication numbers. It is possible that productivity below these recommended ranges could still result in a positive promotion and tenure review if evidence can be presented that the candidate's independent research program is having a strong impact (see above for guidelines for demonstrating impact).

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. Overall, the publication history being reviewed for awarding of promotion and tenure should be of sufficient quantity and quality to document a faculty member's influence in discovery of new knowledge in their field and their ability to effectively communicate their data to the scientific community. ***Thus, quality and impact are the most important criteria for promotion, but quantity is also important.***

- ***Research funding.*** Faculty are expected to support their independent research programs and to obtain salary recovery that meets or exceeds the obligations as defined in their most recent Ohio State contract. Evidence of sustained or multiple grant support is another crucial indicator of expertise in the field. Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must have obtained NIH funding as a principal investigator (PI) on an R01 or as a program director or principal investigator on a large NIH grant (multiple-PD/PI) (i.e., multicenter R01 or equivalent such as a project on a P01, U54), or equivalent funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) or have obtained a mid-career K award. Other nationally competitive, peer reviewed funding sources recognized by the Department of Neuroscience include prominent national charitable foundations (e.g., American Heart Association, American Diabetes Association, American Cancer Society, the Lupus Foundation, the March of Dimes, etc.), industry grants, or large grants from other federal entities such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Department of Defense). Should faculty be able to provide evidence for a sustained record of funding from these types of agencies but without NIH R01 funding, this would satisfy the criterion for obtaining nationally competitive peer reviewed funding. Similarly, faculty members who generate support for their research programs through investigator-initiated grants or contracts from pharmaceutical or instrumentation companies, creation of spin-off companies or as a co-investigator, co-principal investigator, or other comparable role on collaborative grants may also meet the criteria for extramural funding.

The key is providing unequivocal evidence for sustainability of funding their research program since the principal reason for obtaining research support is to allow the work to progress. ***Therefore, the final arbiter of research success is not the amount of funding, but the quality and impact of the research program and its archival publications.***

- ***Research independence and collaboration.*** Research collaboration is an important means for attaining new knowledge and is encouraged. Because junior faculty who are just initiating their careers may not have a sufficient number of students and postdoctoral fellows in their laboratories to assist in conducting experiments, they are encouraged to develop collaborations. Fruitful collaborations usually involve important and recognizable contributions from each of the collaborators. 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. Further, it is important for candidates to identify how the collaboration relates to the candidate's own research program.

Teaching. Teaching is defined as didactic lecturing and other means of communicating knowledge of neuroscience to students at the undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral and post-graduate levels. The departmental teaching mission includes undergraduate teaching (lectures, laboratory, and independent study) professional teaching (medical), graduate and post-doctoral teaching (didactic and laboratory instruction), advising, and mentoring.

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires a distinctive record of teaching and mentoring excellence. Teaching excellence is most commonly demonstrated through student and peer evaluations. Teaching excellence also can be documented by contributions to curricular development and/or revision, development of new and effective teaching techniques, teaching awards, self-evaluations, and peer review of curriculum/content (course materials) and classroom teaching (if done systematically over time with the goal of offering constructive criticism). Development of impactful, innovative programs that integrate teaching and research are valued. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity. Voluntary teaching (seminars, interdisciplinary teaching, invited presentations, CME, etc.) will also be considered.

Many courses taught by this Department involve team teaching. The evaluations of peers involved in team taught courses can be a valuable addition to the teaching portion of the dossier. The evaluations by the course director also will be an important criterion for judging teaching effectiveness.

All faculty are encouraged to participate in the **Teaching Support Program** offered through the University Institute for Teaching and Learning. This program is available to tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty and lecturers.

Evaluations and review of teaching: Both student and peer evaluations are required for promotion and tenure. Information about student evaluations can be obtained by accessing the **Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)**. Members of the probationary faculty member's mentoring committee will perform peer evaluation of teaching. Faculty members should make their mentors aware of when lectures are to be given and ask them to attend for the purpose of providing a peer evaluation. Another form of peer review may be derived from evaluation letters written by Course Directors or other team members in team-taught courses. Peer letters should

include an evaluation of course materials, an assessment of course objectives, a determination of whether the course material is current, whether adequate feedback is provided on exams and assignments and an assessment of classroom teaching performance. Other documentation of teaching may include an administrator's (e.g., Department Chair) assessment of the candidate's teaching load, contribution to the teaching mission of the academic unit, and contribution to curriculum development.

Finally, a candidate may provide a self-evaluation of teaching, as evidence of teaching quality. This self-evaluation should include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching, self-assessment, interpretation of students' and peers' evaluations, and description of specific strategies undertaken for improvement.

Graduate student teaching evaluations may be supplemented by letters from former students if solicited by the Department Chair or the chair of the APT Committee. Additional documentation of effective graduate teaching may include the productivity and employment of former students, participation on graduate examination committees and honors committees for undergraduates. Any other efforts that can be documented as enhancing student learning experiences also will be considered.

Service. Service is defined as supportive activities that contribute to the operation of the department, college, university and the enhancement of the profession. National and international service provides evidence that the faculty member is contributing to the advancement of the profession and the goals of the department and university. Local service includes administrative and committee work for the department, college and university. National or international service to the profession includes editorial service to scholarly publications, peer review assignments, consulting, professional society service, organizing meetings or symposia. In addition, relevant community service, such as giving presentations at local schools or serving as a judge for regional Science Fairs for middle and high school students will be considered as service.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, effective service must be demonstrated. Evidence of excellence in this area will include specific examples of both local and national service activity including serving as an editorial referee for high quality professional journals in the candidate's discipline, service in major professional societies in the faculty's field of research, invitations to consult or review grants for federal agencies and private foundations and receiving awards for service contributions.

Promotion to Professor

Scholarship. Promotion to Professor is an acknowledgement that the candidate has reached a level of excellence and pre-eminence in their field. The candidate should be able to show that his/her research program has benefited colleagues and students at the University and in the research community at large. The most important criterion for the awarding of promotion to the rank of Professor will be based upon clear and unambiguous evidence that the candidate has a sustained, eminent record of achievement that is recognized nationally and internationally. There are many indicators of excellence and impact. Indicators used by the APT Committee to make judgments include:

Research Impact. Promotion to Professor will be based on documented evidence of sustained excellence in research and scholarly activities since their promotion to Associate Professor.

They should have maintained an externally recognized, independent research program, which has contributed substantially to the departmental mission and to the candidate's field of study. The committee will look for evidence that the candidate has been recognized as an important participant or leader in the research community. The candidate should have played a national leadership role or attained international recognition for their research. Such evidence should include awards from scientific societies, invitations to present research findings at other institutions and at national and especially at international scientific meetings, appointments to editorial boards or repeated invitations to review manuscripts or grant proposals, appointments as a member to national review bodies such as NIH study sections or scientific advisory boards, responsibilities as an organizer of scientific meetings, invitations to provide critical reviews of a research topic, and assignments as a consultant to government agencies and private foundations or companies. External evaluators' comments can also contribute to this category.

Specific criteria considered by the APT Committee in making judgments about excellence and impact will include the following:

- *Letters from external evaluators.* These should be from senior scientists, normally Professors, who are familiar with research in the candidate's field(s) of research who are qualified to assess the importance and quality of his/her research program and its published results. The guidelines for soliciting these letters are the same as described for obtaining external letters of evaluation as described in the College of Medicine document.
- *Publications.* The candidate must demonstrate that their research has continued to have a major impact on the field as evidenced by a consistent record of high quality publications that exceed the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor. On average, a candidate for promotion to Professor will have published ~25-35 papers since their promotion to Associate Professor. This will vary for individuals depending on their specific sub-discipline and the journals that they target for publication. Regardless, the number should reflect a consistent record of publication, both as senior author and as co-author with collaborators. A further evaluation is the number of citations to individual papers, a consistent increase in annual citations to published articles and the overall number of citations to the body of work. Evidence that the candidate for promotion has been instrumental in the research and writing of the publications should be provided by an annotated bibliography that indicates the individual's contributions to each work. The number of publications that satisfies these criteria will depend upon their quality and impact on the field. Substantive review articles and books also will be given consideration. ***Thus, quality and impact are the most important criteria for promotion, but quantity is also important.***
- *Research funding.* Candidates for promotion to Professor will be expected to have developed *and maintained* nationally competitive and peer reviewed extramural funding to support their research program including sustained NIH funding since their promotion to Associate Professor. At a minimum, candidates for promotion to Professor must be a PI or co-PD/PI on at least one NIH funded R01 (or equivalent) grant with a history of at least one competitive renewal or additional new grant. Consistent funding of a research program by national agencies is taken as evidence of continued productivity and contribution to the field. Dossiers without significant and consistent funding from external agencies will need to be bolstered by evidence that such funding was not available, or that the research program was unique and not fundable by conventional means. In such cases, substantial evidence of attempts to obtain funding will be needed.

Teaching and Mentoring. The criteria used to evaluate teaching excellence for promotion to Associate Professor will also be used for promotion to Professor; however, additional criteria may also be relevant. Specifically, evidence that the candidate's former students and postdoctoral fellows have obtained meaningful employment, academic or otherwise, is evidence of effective teaching/mentoring. Another example of teaching includes serving as a mentor for junior faculty. All mentee(s), student and faculty, should provide an evaluation of the mentoring relationship for inclusion with the candidate's dossier.

Service. For promotion to Professor, evidence of consistent service excellence is required. Evidence of excellence in this area will include service as an editorial referee, appointments to editorial boards and editorships for high quality professional journals in the candidate's discipline; and would include leadership roles and elected offices in major professional societies in the faculty's field; invitations to consult or review grants; appointments to grant review boards for federal agencies and private foundations; and awards for service contribution. Exemplary service and emergence of leadership activities at the national and international level will greatly enhance the case for promotion to Professor.

Promotion of Research Faculty

For Research faculty, the criteria for promotion focus principally on the category of research. Although the standards are similar to those used for the Tenure Track for each faculty rank, overall expectations for research output are higher since 100% of effort for research faculty members is devoted to research.

Appendix

1. College of Medicine Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Document:

https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/governance-documents/college-of-medicine/COM_APT_2012-09-19.pdf

2. Faculty Checklist for Annual Review

1. Upload your current CV and peer-review of teaching to **Box** – A private folder has been created for each faculty member.
2. Use the new **Teaching and Service Time Allocations Guidelines** (2 separate documents – see Appendix) to estimate your time commitments in these two mission areas. Your remaining time (out of 100%) should be >50% and will be your estimated time allocated for research. Guidelines for **Annual Research Expectations** can be found starting on **page 9** of this document. If your time allocated to Teaching and Service is >50%, don't worry, we will work that out during the review meeting. Enter all estimated percentages across the three mission areas into the **Faculty Spreadsheet** (see Appendix).
3. Enter all other data indicated in the **Faculty Spreadsheet**.
4. Complete a 1-page (**maximum**) narrative describing your research output and impact, research funding, teaching and service for the past year. Upload this document to Box. The goal of the narrative is to capture important facts and subtleties that cannot be captured with numbers in the spreadsheet. This narrative should also include your goals in each mission area and a brief description of how you see yourself fitting into the Department, College, University and your chosen field of research. (What are your career and personal development goals?) I have provided a sample narrative using myself as an example (**Faculty Narrative Example** – see Appendix).

The following rating scale will be used to score your performance in each of the following areas – *research output and impact, research funding, teaching and service*.

- 0.0 – no significant activity in mission area
- 1.0 – below expectations for position
- 1.5 – meets expectations for position with some room for improvement
- 2.0 – meets expectations for position
- 2.5 – meets expectations for position with demonstrated excellence in some areas
- 3.0 – exceeds expectations for position

3. Service Time Allocation Guidelines

A tenure track faculty member is expected to *provide administrative service to the University, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university.* The Department of Neuroscience Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Document provides details on service expectations for time-in-rank. The purpose of this document is to guide annual estimates for time allocated to service. The examples below are examples of typical service activities and conservative time requirements each of these service activities.

- Manuscript peer-review ~3h/manuscript (assuming 10/year): 30h/year
- Ad-hoc peer review for grant proposals (e.g., for standard NIH grant) = 10h/grant x 6 grants + 16h travel = 76h/year (for permanent members, multiply x3)
- Serve on a local (OSU) committee: 1h meeting/1x month = 12h/year
- Serve on a national/international committee: 1h meeting/1x month = 12h/year
- Write letters of recommendation (~30min/letter): 6 letters/year = 3h/year

Total: 133h/y (~8% time allocation)

For those serving as editors, permanent members of study sections, Directors of graduate programs (or similar), leadership positions in national or international societies, etc., service allocations would easily exceed 10-15% or more each year.

(10% effort would = 175 h/y or average of 3.5h/week)

4. Teaching Time Allocation Estimates

A typical faculty member will primarily have their teaching responsibilities defined as a mentor to graduate and/or undergraduate students. They also will participate in didactic lecturing, usually as part of a team-taught course where they will give 1-3 lectures, prepare exam questions for the lectures and meet with students. The text below provides guidelines to help you to estimate your annual % effort dedicated to teaching/instructional activity.

As defined by OAA, full-time, twelve-month, faculty members are expected to be on duty for an average of nineteen working days a month, with working days defined as weekdays that are not designated as university holidays. Using these as a guidelines, there are ~1,750 work hours/year (assumes 2 weeks/year for vacation) for a 12-month faculty. The percent time allocations below were derived using 1,750h/y or 35h/week as baseline metrics.

10% effort would = 175 h/y or 3.5h/week
15% effort would = 263h/y or 5h/week
20% effort would = 350h/y or 7h/week
30% effort would = 525/y or 10.5h/week
40% effort would = 700/y or 14 h/week
50% effort would = 875/y or 17.5 h/week
60% effort would = 1050h/y or 23h/week

Estimated time to mentor graduate/undergraduate students

PhD student:

- Bi-weekly: 1h individual meetings (0.5h week/student)
- Bi-weekly: 2h research-in-progress group data meetings (1h/week total)
- Reading/editing writing, data sets, providing feedback on experiments, career guidance, etc. mostly via email or in prep for individual or group meetings (2h/week/student)
- Weekly lab meetings (admin and data) (1h/week total)

For a lab with one PhD student, ~3h/week per student + 1h/week for lab meetings = ~4h/week = 200 hours/year = **11% effort**

For a lab with two PhD students, up to 6h/week = 300 hours/year = **17%**

Undergraduate Students:

Since undergraduates usually work with graduate students and do not write manuscripts, significantly less time is needed to mentor undergraduates. On average, undergraduate laboratory training is expected to take $\frac{1}{2}$ effort of that required to train a new graduate student. So a conservative estimate would be to add **1 hours/week = 50 hours/year (= 3% effort)** for each undergraduate student.

If the student(s) are doing an honors thesis project, estimate time as if they were a first year graduate student.

Based on these estimates, any faculty member who is mentoring at least one PhD student is

teaching at a minimum of 10-15% effort. Two or more students raise this to 15 - 20%. Each undergraduate student adds ~ 3%. However, this effort is shared with research efforts as many of the activities overlap with research direction.

Estimated time requirements for didactic lecturing

Giving a Lecture

Each lecture (conventional):

- 4h preparation for an established lecture (Formatting/Objectives/Director)
- 2h to set up AV and give the lecture (Contact Hours)
- 1h meeting with students outside of class
- 0.5h answering emails
- 0.5h creating/disseminating evaluative questions
- 5h grading evaluative questions (~20 min/student; for 15 students in a course = 5h).

Estimated % Effort for:

- 1 lecture = $13\text{h}/1750 = 0.8\%$
- 2 lectures = $26\text{ h}/1750 = 1.5\%$
- 3 lectures = $39\text{ h}/1750 = 2.2\%$

Note: If developing a new lecture (instead of giving an established lecture) add 20 hours to the above estimates

Directing a Team-Taught Graduate Course

- Organize and Develop Schedule, Identify/verify lecturers, help lecturers with content, as needed, Create Syllabus: 20h
- Course Set-Up and Maintenance (Carmen Site, Messages to Students, messages to lecturers, 1 hours/week Carmen Maintenance (posting content, adding people), managing complications with lecturers/scheduling: 10h
- Exam Management: 56h total:
 - Creating/updating exams – 5h/exam x 4 exams - 20h
 - Entering exam scores (4 exams/semester; 1h/exam) – 4 hours
 - Calculating grades (1 time at end of course) – 2h
 - Meet with students after exams (4 exams x 10 students (average) x 0.5h/student) – 20h
 - Exam reschedules due to absences – 5h
 - Remediation/retake/fail issues – 5h
- Addressing student questions before taking the class, student permission, special accommodations, registration issues: 10h
- Hearing and addressing lecturer/graduate program director or academic advisor concerns, complaints, comments, student review, requests for information: 10h
- Analyzing SEIs and providing feedback: 10h

Total: 116h for directing a team-taught graduate course (6.6% effort)

Organize Course Without Giving any Lectures (e.g., Seminar or Journal Club, 1 credit hour): 51 hours = 2.9%

- 5h: Organize and Develop Schedule (over the entire year)
- 23h: Attend each session (includes set up of AV) = 1.5 hour/week x 15 weeks = 22.5 hours
- 22.5h: create and disseminate feedback to students/post grades 1.5 hours x 15 weeks

Total = ~50h/1750 = 2.8%

Directing a 3 credit hour Undergraduate Course (assuming responsibility for all lectures and exams)

Student contact hours/course: 135 hours

- 3 credit hour course generally meets 2x/week for 1.3 hours = 2.6 + .4 for discussions before and after class = 3 contact hours/week, Semester = 15 weeks so total contact hours = 45 hours.
- Office hours (scheduled or unscheduled): 4h/week x 15 weeks = 60 hours
- Answering student Emails regarding content, ~2h/week = 30 hours

Administration: 40 hours

- Setting up course (syllabus), activating class, communication with students: 4h
- Carmen Management and other online programs (i.e. Socrative), determining final grades, registering grades with registrar: 2 hours/week x 15 weeks = 30h
- Managing student issues (poor performance/disability services/advising/absences/behavior issues): 6h

Preparing Established Lectures: 90 hours

- 3 hours/lecture, 2 lectures/week = 6h/week
- 15 week semester (15x6)

Creating New Lectures (one per year on average): 20 hours

Exam Preparation & Grading: 52 hours

- Preparing an established exam = 4 hours x 4 exams = 16h
- Grading = 4h x 4 exams = 16h
- Posting grades for large class = 1h x 4 exams = 4h
- Scheduling, administering and grading make up exams = 4h/exam = 16h

Total: 337 hours/course = 19% effort year/course

EFFORT SUMMARY:

Mentoring PhD students: 11-17%

Mentoring non-thesis undergraduate student: 3%/student

Didactic lectures in team taught course: 0.8%/lecture

Directing team taught graduate course: 7.2% + 0.8%/lecture given

Directing seminar/discussion course: 3%

Course Director for undergraduate course: 19%/course

5. Annual Faculty Narrative/Goals - Example

Research: This past year I published 10 manuscripts, including 3 review articles. I was senior author on all but 4 of these manuscripts. On the others, I provided significant intellectual input to the experimental design or execution and analysis of data. I participate in writing and editing all manuscripts. I also provided 10 invited lectures at national and international venues, including two keynote lectures. I recover >90% of my salary from several NIH and foundation grants. I am PI on three NIH grants, co-I on an NIH contract and sub-contract PI on another NIH grant. I also recover salary from a pharmaceutical company-sponsored contract. My scholarly achievements were recognized by the University - I was named as a University Distinguished Scholar. I submitted an R35 Outstanding Investigator Award to NIH, three letters of intent to private foundations and helped write a new NIH T32 proposal as co-I. If funded, the R35 would support 50% of my salary for 8 years. If not funded, my goal is to maintain 2 NIH R01s and at least one additional grant or contract. I expect that in my new role as Department Chair, my research output will decline. I am working now on changing my lab organization and management structure to minimize the impact that my new role will have on my trainees and overall research productivity. For example, I am consolidating the varied interests across my current research team to explore a single unifying hypothesis, i.e., high morbidity and mortality after spinal cord injury is caused by systemic meta-inflammation. My intent is to align most of my research with the vision of the new Belford Spinal Cord Injury Center. I will serve as Executive Director for this Center. I cannot anticipate how much time will be required in this new role. Likely, I will be extending my 8-10h work day, working more on the weekends again and making new hires to help manage workload.

Teaching: As holder of the Poppleton Research Designated Chair, I do not have formal teaching expectations. However, I still spend >15% of my time teaching, mostly through research mentoring. I am the primary advisor for five PhD students and 5 post-doctoral fellows. I also give one didactic lecture and lead a journal club discussion each year (~3 contact hours on average for two different courses/year).

Service: I served on numerous committees in the Department, the College and the University. A significant proportion of time was spent as a member of the Search Committee for the Department of Neurology Chair (>25h) and on the Dean's Research Steering Committee (>6h). I review on average, 1-2 manuscripts each month, although over the past 6 months, I have been rejecting ~90% of all invitations to review. I still provide significant peer review for funding agencies. I am a member of the Scientific Advisory or Review Boards for several national and international SCI foundations. I also am Chair of the SAB for Unite 2 Fight Paralysis and serve as a consultant on a number of other advisory panels in academia and industry. I provided ad-hoc review for an NIH study section in Apr 2018. Collectively, my peer review and service activities account for ~25% of my time each year. Even with my higher refusal rate for reviews, this time commitment has not changed in the past 5-8 years.

Goals: I remain passionate about my discovery-based research program. However, in the future, more of my lab will be emphasizing translational research, with the goal of using data from our lab to develop clinical interventions or at a minimum, to guide clinical research programs that can validate our pre-clinical data. These efforts will be aligned with the Belford Center. In parallel, with my new role in the Belford Center, I also serve as Director for the Center for Brain and Spinal Cord Repair (CBSCR). In that role, I will continue to expand the CBSCR footprint within the College and across the University. This will be accomplished in part by working with OSU leadership in the Discovery Themes-Chronic Brain Injury program to align spinal cord and brain injury research under a single "neurotrauma" umbrella. I plan to reduce my travel commitments by ~50%, although I still want to maintain my internationally visible research program. At the College level, I will continue to work on and seek new opportunities to participate in committees that are dedicated to improving the research infrastructure at Ohio State. As the new Chair of the Department, I will be recruiting and working on a number of other initiatives that I hope will improve our culture and increase funding success rates for faculty in the Department.