

# **APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

**Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology**

**\*Adopted by the faculty June, 2014**

Update: Approved by OAA 2/25/2019

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>PREAMBLE</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT MISSION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>DEFINITIONS</b> .....	<b>2-4</b>
<b>APPOINTMENTS</b>	
Criteria: Tenure-track Faculty .....	4-5
Criteria: Associated Faculty and Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	5-6
Criteria: Research Faculty.....	6-7
Procedures: Tenure-track Faculty .....	7
Procedures: Associated Faculty and Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	7-8
Procedures: Research Faculty.....	9-10
<b>ANNUAL REVIEWS</b>	
Procedures: Probationary Faculty .....	10-13
Procedures: Tenured Faculty.....	10-13
Procedures: Research Faculty.....	10-13
<b>MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS</b>	
Criteria.....	14-15
Procedures .....	15-16
Documentation .....	16-17
<b>REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION</b>	
Criteria: Promotion to rank of Associate Professor with Tenure ....	22-27
Criteria: Promotion to rank of Professor.....	27-30
Procedures:.....	31-33
Documentation .....	33-35
<b>APPEALS</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS</b> .....	<b>35-36</b>
<b>POINTS TO CONSIDER IN THE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING</b> .....	<b>37-39</b>

## **PREAMBLE**

This document is a supplement to Chapter 3335-6 and 3335-7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure) <https://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules>, the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) and any additional policies established by the College and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the Department shall follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect these changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the departmental chair.

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College, Executive Vice President, and Provost of the University before it can be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission statement and, in context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document the dean and provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for the positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The Department of Physiology and Cell Biology Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee is abbreviated P&T Committee throughout.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles of Peer Review and Equal Opportunity articulated in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-01](#)

## **DEPARTMENT MISSION**

The mission of the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology within the College of Medicine and The Ohio State University has three fundamental components. First is to educate undergraduate, graduate, and professional students in the physiological and cell biological sciences and skills basic to practice of medicine, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy and other allied health professions. Graduate education, which is incorporated in this function, prepares students for careers in physiological and cell biological research, research management and teaching. Second is to conduct basic and applied research that extends the frontiers of physiological and cell biological science at all levels of biological organization from molecules to the whole organism with relevance for the solution of health problems in humans and animals. Third is to provide service and expertise to The Ohio State University, the State of Ohio and national/international biomedical organizations.

## **DEFINITIONS SECTION**

### **A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

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

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department.

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

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

#### **2. Research Faculty**

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of research faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the department.

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

#### **3. 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 the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion or appointment review of that candidate.

#### **4. Minimum Composition**

In the event that the department does not have at least five eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

### **A. Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Department of Physiology and Cell Biology has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of at least five individuals (tenured professors or tenured associate professors) elected by the eligible departmental faculty. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible.

### **B. Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. 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 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.

#### **C1. Appointment**

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

#### **C2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal**

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when two-thirds of the votes are positive.

## **APPOINTMENTS**

### **Criteria: Tenure-track faculty**

In accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) (A), appointments to the faculty shall promote the stated mission of "attaining international distinction in education, scholarship and public service". Thus, the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology is committed to making faculty appointments that enhance the quality of the departmental

teaching, research, and service missions. Decisions regarding all faculty appointments shall be based on criteria that reflect strong potential for success in attaining tenure and advancing through the faculty ranks.

A. Instructor

At this time, the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology does not appoint individuals to this Title and Rank.

B. Assistant Professor appointments:

The minimum requirement for appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a field of study broadly identified with physiology and/or cell biology plus postdoctoral experience. Assistant Professor appointees shall document substantial contributions to their field of study as reflected by publications in peer-reviewed journals and the demonstrated potential to obtain extramural funding for research. As defined in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor are always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. The granting of prior service credit which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted. Assistant Professors are reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an Assistant Professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

C. Associate Professor and Professor appointments:

The requirements for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor positions are consistent with the criteria outlined for promotion to these ranks. As defined in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), appointments to the rank of Professor or Associate Professor shall generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition by the Department and College. All appointments to the rank of Professor or Associate Professor and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

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

**Criteria: Associated faculty and courtesy appointments for Associated faculty**

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

- Have significant and meaningful interaction in at least one of the following mission
  - Have written support for appointment by the appropriate Division Director or Department Chair to which they are appointed.
- areas of the College of Medicine:
- a) Teaching of medical students, residents, or fellows:
  - b) Research: These faculty members may collaborate with a Department or Division in the College in research projects or other scholarly activities.
  - c) Administrative roles within the College: This includes participation in committees or other leadership activities (e.g., membership in the Medical Student Admissions Committee).

**Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct**

**Professor.** Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated.

Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Criteria for appointment at advanced rank are the same as for promotion. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

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

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

**Courtesy Appointment for Faculty**

A non-salaried joint appointment for a University faculty member from another department is considered a Courtesy appointment. An individual with an appointment in one department may request a Courtesy appointment in another department when that faculty member's scholarly and academic activity overlaps significantly with the discipline represented by the second unit. Such appointments must be made in the same faculty rank (i.e., 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.

**Criteria: Research Faculty**

Research faculty appointments are fixed term contract appointments that do not entail tenure. Research faculty represent researchers and shall be engaged in research related to the mission and goals of the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology.

A. Research Assistant Professor appointments:

Research Assistant Professor appointments shall be defined as category A or category B. Category A appointments are defined as early-stage research faculty that have yet to succeed in acquiring extramural salary support and are dependent on a principal investigator for support of their salary. Category B appointments are defined as advanced research faculty who generate their salary in its entirety from extramural sources. For category A appointments, the annual performance and annual salary adjustment will be evaluated by the principal investigator. For category B appointments, their annual performance and salary adjustment will be evaluated by the Merit Committee and the Department Chair.

The minimum requirement for appointment to the rank of Research Assistant Professor at either Category A or B is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a field of study broadly identified with physiology and/or cell biology plus postdoctoral experience. Research Assistant Professor appointees shall document substantial contributions to their field of study as reflected by publications in peer-reviewed journals and the demonstrated potential to obtain extramural funding for their individual research.

B. Research Associate Professor and Professor appointments:

At this time, the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology does not appoint individuals to this Title and Rank.

**Procedures: Tenure-track faculty**

The departmental Chair shall discuss with the faculty the departmental goals, philosophy and strategic missions for appointments to the faculty. For each appointment to the faculty, a national search shall be conducted by a departmental Search Committee. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The departmental Search Committee and search committee chairperson shall be appointed by the departmental Chair. The Search Committee will typically consist of five members including a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants. Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#).

The responsibility of the Search Committee is to identify candidates that are most qualified to enhance and contribute to the departmental goals, philosophy and strategic missions. Accordingly, the search committee shall draft an appropriate position description and advertise the position locally and nationally. 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 prominent professional journal.

The Search Committee will then generate, review and evaluate a diverse pool of applicants and provide the departmental Chair with a short list of three to six candidates that are assessed as the most qualified to enhance and contribute to the departmental goals, philosophy and strategic missions. In consultation with the chair of the Search Committee, the departmental chair will arrange for a visit by the selected candidate(s) during which time the candidate will give a seminar and interview with departmental faculty. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format. After this visit, the P&T Committee shall advise the departmental Chair by letter of the suitability of the candidates for appointment in the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology. The departmental Chair shall discuss the candidates with the departmental faculty at a faculty meeting to form the basis for decisions regarding eventual hiring actions. The departmental Chair shall negotiate the conditions of appointment with the selected candidate. 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.

### **Procedures: Associated faculty and courtesy appointments**

The process for associated and courtesy (or adjunct) appointments shall be initiated by a letter of request from the faculty member. Letters of request should include: (1) reasons for the request, (2) a statement of potential benefits of the appointment for both the faculty member and the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology, (3) documentation of previous contributions to and associations with the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology, and (4) any additional information of relevance. Requests for associated or courtesy appointments must include a current curriculum vitae and a letter of concurrence from the candidate’s supervisor.

Requests for associated and courtesy (or adjunct) appointments shall be reviewed by the P&T Committee. The basis for review shall include: (1) the training and background of the applicant relative to the disciplines of Physiology and Cell Biology, (2) the compatibility of the applicant's research interests with the overall departmental mission, and (3) the capacity and willingness of the applicant to contribute to the teaching, research and/or service missions of the Department. The P&T Committee shall advise the departmental Chair by letter of a positive or negative recommendation for granting an associated or courtesy appointment. The recommendation shall be presented to the faculty by the P&T Committee chair at a faculty meeting.

Associated appointments shall be awarded for a period of three years whereas courtesy appointments shall be awarded for a period of five years. Renewal of associated and courtesy appointments shall be subject to review by the P&T Committee and the

departmental Chair at the appropriate time. The P&T Committee shall notify associated and courtesy appointees by letter of the approaching renewal date and inquire about interest in renewal of the appointment. Consideration for renewal shall require: (1) a letter from the appointee stating interest in reappointment and the perceived benefits of reappointment, (2) a letter of support from the Chair of the appointee's primary department, and (3) a current curriculum vitae. The P&T Committee shall advise the departmental Chair by letter of a positive or negative recommendation for renewal of the appointment. The recommendation shall be placed on the agenda of a faculty meeting and be presented to the faculty by the P&T Committee chair. If not renewed, the appointment shall terminate automatically at the end of the appointment period.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews below), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the departmental Chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the Dean's recommendation is negative.

### **Procedures: Research Faculty**

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class, an exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college Dean. All research faculty will be appointed to fixed-term contracts of a minimum of one year duration and lasting for no more than five years. All contracts must explicitly state the expectations for salary support and will require 100% salary recovery from extramural funds by the research faculty member. The initial contract will be 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. During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, research faculty appointments may be terminated for not meeting the terms of the contract (e.g., failure to obtain extramural support for their research). Appointments may also be terminated during a contract period for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code), or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code), and the termination decision for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by faculty rules. In addition, a contract may be re-negotiated during a contract period only with the voluntary consent of the research faculty member.

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. The terms of a new contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment. The standards of notice set forth in rule [3335-6-08](#) of the Administrative Code will apply to research faculty appointments.

### **Transfer from the tenure-track to research faculty**

The Department of Physiology and Cell Biology shall provide for the possibility of transfer from the tenure-track faculty to a research faculty position if appropriate to departmental and faculty circumstances. A request for transfer must be initiated by the tenure-track faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed and the rank at which the faculty member expects to be appointed in the research. Appointment at the same rank as held in the tenure-track will be assumed unless circumstances dictate otherwise. The departmental Appointments, Promotions and Tenure Committee will review requests for transfer and the expected rank and submit a recommendation for or against the transfer and the requested rank to the department chair. The department Chair, the College of Medicine Dean, and The Ohio State University Executive Vice President and Provost must approve all transfers. Tenure is relinquished when a tenured faculty member transfers to research faculty.

#### Transfer from research faculty to the tenure-track

Transfers from research faculty to the tenure-track are not permitted. Nevertheless, research faculty may apply for tenure-positions and compete in national searches for such positions by the department or other departments or units in the university.

### **ANNUAL REVIEWS**

#### **Procedures: Probationary faculty**

The progress of probationary faculty shall be reviewed annually during the probationary period. The following statements are direct quotes from faculty rule [3335-6-03](#) or condensations from that rule. Reviews are also in accord with Office of Academic Affairs policies set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review](#).

- A. At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing tenure including: the Department, College, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents as required by faculty rule [3335-6-03\(C\)](#). These documents shall be provided by the departmental chair and available on the Department Website.
  
- B. An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the office of academic affairs upon petition of the tenure- initiating unit and college. Promotion and/or tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and/or promotion. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated during any probationary year because of inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a non-renewal decision must be based upon the results of a formal review conducted in accord with the fourth year procedures as set in paragraph C below. During the

probationary period, an annual review shall evaluate the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service. The departmental Chair shall inform all probationary faculty members at the time of appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place. At the completion of the review, the departmental Chair shall provide the faculty member and the Dean of the College with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The assessment should include both the strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. If the chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another year of service, that recommendation shall be final. As noted above, a recommendation from the chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures (see paragraph C below) and the Dean shall make the final decision in the matter. In the case of a recommendation for non-renewal of the yearly contract, the faculty member may appeal this decision in writing within ten days after the receipt of the evaluation letter according to the procedures set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#) as noted in the Appeals section of this document. All annual review letters (and any responses and/or comments) to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews including the review for promotion and tenure.

The annual review of probationary faculty. The P&T Committee will act as a subcommittee of the eligible faculty for the review of each probationary faculty member. The committee will vote on whether the appointment should be renewed, and will prepare a report for the Department Chair. The P&T Committee shall evaluate the progress of probationary faculty every year during the probationary period. At the beginning of the autumn semester, each faculty member shall provide the P&T Committee with an updated curriculum vitae together with a summary of accomplishments since the last review. These materials must be compiled using the Office of Academic Affairs Dossier outline. The committee shall evaluate these materials and prepare a draft letter to the departmental Chair which details the progress made toward promotion and tenure as well as any areas that need further improvement. The chair of the P&T Committee will review this draft letter with the faculty member under review to verify factual accuracy of the information before the final P&T Committee's letter is forwarded to the departmental Chair. The departmental Chair shall then prepare a letter of evaluation to be given to the faculty member under review. The faculty member will then have the option to comment on this letter, in writing, within 10 days after the receipt of the letter. Both the departmental Chair's letter and any written comments made by the candidate shall be included in the candidate's dossier.

- C. If the P&T Committee recommends non-renewal, the case shall be put before a vote of all eligible faculty. The vote is then tabulated and included as part of the report forwarded to the Chair. As noted above, if the Chair decides for non-renewal then the fourth year procedures are followed (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)). The fourth year review differs from other annual reviews in requiring College level review. Upon completion of the fourth year review, renewal of the appointment of a probationary Assistant Professor for a fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the College. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the tenure initiating unit's recommendation, the Dean must consult with the College

Promotion and Tenure Committee.

- D. Mandatory review for tenure effectively ends the probationary period and culminates in submission by the department of the University form, *Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment*, which either recommends promotion (note promotion entails tenure), tenure, or non-renewal. As previously noted, a faculty member can appeal any negative decision according to the procedures detailed below.
- E. Exclusion of time from probationary periods is described in detail in Faculty Rule [3335-6-03\(0\)](#).
- F. Department of Physiology and Cell Biology procedures for annual reviews of probationary faculty.

### **Procedures: Tenured Faculty**

Professors and associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

### **Procedures: Research Faculty**

The progress and status of research faculty shall be reviewed annually. An annual review shall evaluate the faculty member's performance in scholarly research and success in competing for extramural sources of research and salary funding. The department Chair shall inform all research faculty at the time of appointment and in timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place. At the completion of the review, the department Chair shall provide the faculty member and College of Medicine Dean with a written assessment of the performance and professional development of the research faculty member. The assessment shall include strengths and weaknesses as appropriate. If the chair's decision is to renew the contract of the faculty member for another year that recommendation shall be final. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. In the case of non-renewal of the annual contract, the faculty member may appeal this decision in writing within ten days after receipt of the evaluation letter according to the procedures set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#) as noted in the Appeals section of this document. All annual review letters (and any responses and/or comments) to date shall become a part of the research faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews including review for contract renewal.

## **MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS**

### **Criteria**

Consistent with the mission of the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology, recommendations for merit salary increases shall be based upon an evaluation of performance in the following areas: teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The Merit Committee shall also provide the departmental Chair with nominations for awards and other such opportunities for honor of individual excellence that may arise.

#### A. Teaching

Evaluation of teaching performance shall be based upon both the quantity and the quality of teaching. Quantity shall be determined in part by the number of formal lectures given by the faculty member in the courses offered by the department. Extra credit shall be assigned to course directors to reflect the additional responsibilities required for administration. Consideration also will be given for: 1) serving as major/permanent research advisor to graduate students, 2) participation in special graduate activities such as laboratories and student rotations, 3) participation as a member of qualifying, general and final examination committees, 4) advising professional and/or undergraduate student research and 5) formal advising of junior or mid-career faculty. The quality of teaching shall be assessed by means of student evaluation of instruction and documented peer review letters. Note that quantity alone will not be sufficient to receive the highest teaching merit score.

#### B. Research/Scholarship

Evaluation of productivity in research shall be based upon the quality and quantity of publications, patents, or other evidence of scholarship subject to peer-review, and the amount and sources of research funding and salary recovery on grants or licenses. Only activity during the prior calendar year shall be considered as part of the current review year. The highest priority for peer-reviewed publications shall be given to first or senior (i.e., publications of the faculty member's students or postdoctoral fellows) authored publications in peer-reviewed journals. **Only manuscripts first published during the calendar year under review will be considered.** As such, publications listed as in press shall not be considered as part of the evaluation, and publications previously released in electronic versions cannot be counted when a new format is available. Measures of impact will be used to evaluate quality of publications when available. The highest priority for research funding shall be given for principal investigators on grants from nationally competitive, peer-reviewed, sources.

#### C. Service

Service encompasses work that provides professional expertise to the Department, College, University and/or national or international biomedical organizations.

Evidence of leadership in policy decisions will be given the highest credit. To assist in comparisons of effort, each service assignment should include an estimate of the average monthly hours required. Additional community service and fundraising related to appropriate professional outreach for the Department, College, University

or biomedical research organizations will also be considered.

### **Procedures:**

Annual Merit shall be evaluated by a departmental Merit Committee.

#### A. Duties and functions of the Merit Committee

1. The Merit Committee shall review and evaluate all faculty of the department for accomplishments in teaching, research, and service, in accordance with the criteria described above. These reviews and evaluations shall be based upon the prior calendar year. Deliberations of the Merit Committee shall culminate in a report to the departmental Chair. The report shall be transmitted, in writing, to the departmental Chair to serve as a basis for the recommendation to the Dean. Each faculty member will be notified in writing of the Merit Committee's recommendation regarding his/her merit evaluation. The departmental Chair shall discuss his/her recommendations with the chair of the Merit Committee and communicate them, in writing, to each faculty member under review.
2. The Merit Committee shall propose for ratification, by vote of all eligible departmental faculty, the standards by which faculty members shall be evaluated for merit recommendations. The Merit Committee shall base its evaluation on the criteria established above and the materials provided by each faculty member. The suggested format for the presentation of these materials follows below (see documentation section). It shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that all relevant information on his/her performance is submitted to the Merit Committee by an announced date. **If the faculty member provides documentation insufficient to permit an informed evaluation of their performance, no recommendation regarding merit will be made to the departmental Chair.**

#### B. Standards and procedures for merit evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty

1. The Merit Committee shall evaluate each faculty member based on the information provided and assign a numerical score for each of the three categories: teaching, research and service. Each committee member shall review the materials submitted by the faculty prior to the evaluation meeting and shall score each faculty member by secret ballot in each category. Each category shall be ranked on a 1 to 10 scale, with 1 as lowest merit, 5 as meeting estimated departmental expectations and 10 highest merit. The six scores for each faculty member shall then be averaged to obtain one mean score for each of the three categories: teaching, research and service. The averaged scores shall then be forwarded to the departmental Chair in writing. Each faculty member shall also be given a copy of the average numerical rankings for each category with his/her scores noted. The Chair has authority to override the recommendations for rankings based on the departmental needs and individual expectations. However, significant deviations from the Merit Committee recommendations by

the Chair should be discussed with the Merit Committee Chair and/or faculty member in consideration.

2. In order to provide flexibility in salary raise decisions 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 departments within the College of Medicine. Whenever the Chair believes that an inequity exists, the Chair will recommend an equity adjustment in salary to the Dean.

C. Standards and procedures for merit evaluation of research faculty

The Merit Committee shall evaluate the research faculty member (except category A) based on the information provided and assign a merit score on a 1 - 10 scoring system with 10 the highest merit and 1 the lowest. A score of 5 indicates meeting departmental expectations in research. The scores shall be forwarded to the department Chair in writing. Each faculty member shall be given a copy of the range of all faculty scores with his/her score noted. As described for tenure-track faculty, significant deviations from the Merit Committee recommendations by the chair should be discussed with the Merit Committee chair and/or faculty member in consideration.

D. Appeals

Appeals of the recommendation for merit ratings shall be directed, in writing, to both the Merit Committee and the department Chair. The appeal must be made within 10 days after receipt of the written merit recommendation. The appeal shall be reviewed in a joint meeting of the departmental Chair and the Committee. The outcome of the appeal shall be made in writing to the appellant. The Department of Physiology and Cell Biology also recognizes the right of the faculty to appeal the departmental recommendations to the Dean of the College and/or the College Grievance and Appeals Committee. The faculty member also has the right to request an equity/market adjustment following the Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Salary appeals guidelines if he or she meets the eligibility criteria set forth in those guidelines (located at <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>).

**Documentation**

The Merit Committee shall evaluate each faculty member based upon materials supplied that detail performance in research, teaching and service during the previous calendar year. The material should summarize the relevant information to be included in the annual activity report.

## **REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

The review for promotion and tenure shall be based upon Faculty Rule [3335-6-02 \(D\)](#): *In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavors, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.*

### **Procedures**

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

#### **1. Candidate Responsibilities**

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist 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.

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

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the 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. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

## 2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
  - 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.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

**Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures

Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

### 3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are as follows:

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to

vote.

#### 4. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- 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.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by 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.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee'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.

## 5. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a clinical faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the 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 semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

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

## **PROMOTION TO RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE**

### **Criteria:**

According to Faculty Rule [3335-6-02 \(C\)](#): *The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member under review has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.* Furthermore, according to Faculty Rule [3335-6-02 \(B\)](#): *Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor.* University Faculty Rule [3337-6-09\(A\)](#) also states that Assistant Professors must be informed before the start of their seventh year on the decision regarding tenure or non-renewal. Thus, in order to adhere to the standard tenure review sequence, the

sixth year review shall actually begin after five years of service. Based upon these Faculty Rules, the following criteria have been developed for the promotion to the rank of associate professor. The following criteria are general in nature, intended to serve as a set of desired accomplishments in the categories of research, teaching and service that the candidate should achieve before being considered for promotion.

**These guidelines shall serve as a major guide in the review process, but the simple fulfillment of minimum expectations will not, in itself, lead to an automatic consideration for promotion.**

#### A. Research

Scholarship, as manifested by communication of scientific discovery through publications and presentations, and research grant support, is an important criterion in evaluation for promotion. 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 proceedings, and achievement of a national reputation for expertise and impact in one's field of endeavor.

1. In evaluating scholarly accomplishments during the probationary period, the P&T Committee recognizes that there will be different pathways to achieve peer recognition in physiology and cell biology that may reflect the unique aspects of a candidate's scientific expertise, field of research, and/or availability of collaborative research opportunities in the department, college, or university. An assistant professor who single-handedly develops a new field-of-inquiry based on a high-risk, innovative approach or makes a fundamentally important discovery or formulates a theory not previously considered by colleagues in the field may have less opportunity for compiling a large portfolio of multi-authored publications during the probationary period. In contrast, a faculty member who achieves equal recognition among peers for developing a broadly useful scientific assay, experimental technique, or research tools such as animal models or scientific instrumentation may have a large number of colleagues who are interested in adapting these novel methods to their own research programs resulting in numerous, multi-authored publications. Both approaches to scholarly success are recognized as equally valid and important in enhancing the research mission of the institution. Accordingly, two options are available to the candidate in achieving a credible published record of scholarly accomplishment:

**Option A:** Been author on a minimum of 16 peer-reviewed publications of original research while in rank as Assistant Professor or comparable title, with a minimum of 8 publications as senior author. Appropriate journals are those that publish the results and reviews of research in the Assistant Professor's field of expertise (e.g., listings in *Index Medicus*). Appearing as the first or last name in the list of authors for a publication or equivalent designation in the published document denotes senior author status. Media for dissemination of original scholarly research equivalent to printed journals may also be submitted as evidence of scholarly productivity.

**Option B:** Been author on a minimum of 25 peer-reviewed publications of original research while in rank as Assistant Professor or comparable title. Option B is available for faculty members who participate in a variety of productive research collaborations and thus may appear as co-authors or senior authors according to their specific intellectual contribution to the published work. Appropriate journals are those that publish the results and reviews of research in the Assistant Professor's field of expertise (e.g., listings in *Index Medicus*). Appearing as the first or last name in the list of authors for a publication or equivalent designation in the published document denotes senior author status. Media for dissemination of original scholarly research equivalent to printed journals may also be submitted as evidence of scholarly productivity.

While individual circumstances may vary, both the quantity and quality of publications will be considered. Evidence of quality includes the impact factor of the journal in which the publication appears and its level of impact in the Assistant Professor's specialized field. On average, the journals should carry impact factors of 3-6 in the ISI Web of Knowledge® Journal Citation Reports® index, or equivalent measure using a recognized citation report mechanism. Impact of the Assistant Professor's publications in his/her field of expertise can also be related to the number of times a publication or total publications is/are cited by **other** authors. In addition, evidence of citation impact may include authorship of exceptional quality contributions that are too recent to have reached a critical citation count as indicated in external evaluation letters or an outstanding Hirsch-Index (H-Index) value for rank. The departmental P&T Committee will use a reasonable balance of journal impact factor, citations by other authors (e.g., Citation Index), overall quality of the publishing medium and comments from extramural authorities in the Assistant Professor's specialized field as criteria in evaluation of the quality of his/her publication record.

Entrepreneurship is a special form of scholarship valued by the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology. Invention disclosures, copyrights, patent awards and licensing will be recognized as scholarly or service activities and equivalencies to traditional publications will be evaluated on a flexible basis.

2. Received multi-year funding from nationally competitive granting agencies (e.g., National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation) in the form grants, which support the Assistant Professor's personal research.

The Assistant Professor must have been the Principal Investigator or Dual Principal Investigator of record on a minimum of one nationally competitive research grant (funded R01, **PD** of a P01 or equivalent) and must have evidence of renewed or sustained funding by one or more grants at the time of review. Successful award of patents generating income will be considered as a component of the funding portfolio. Participation as Co-Investigator on multiple grants and research funding from industry and/or state or local societies can be positive criteria in the overall evaluation of quality and quantity of research

productivity and potential for growth and sustained success.

## B. Teaching

To receive a positive recommendation for promotion, an Assistant Professor's contribution to teaching must be evaluated as satisfactory in the sixth year review according to the following criteria:

1. A significant contribution to the Departmental Teaching mission as agreed upon in consultation with the Department Chair.
2. Sufficient evidence of satisfactory performance as a lecturer or other mode of instructional presentation derived from formal quantitative student evaluations of the Assistant Professor's performance in the classroom, laboratory and/or Internet based instruction. The candidate should have received advice from the individual's Junior Faculty Advisory Committee on strategies for obtaining "sufficient" evidence of satisfactory performance in teaching during the probationary period.
3. Evaluation of teaching and progress in the quality of teaching in the form of letters from a minimum of three faculty peers who have witnessed a) two or more successive teaching presentations; and/or b) invited didactic lectures at another nationally recognized institution.
4. Receipt of a competitive college or university award for teaching is helpful, but not required for evaluation of teaching as "satisfactory".
5. Received certification by the Graduate Faculty (category P) to be qualified to advise Ph.D. students and to serve as a graduate school representative on general and final examinations.
6. Involvement in graduate education as evidenced by, but not limited to the following: (1) service as major/permanent advisor to graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows, (2) participation in special graduate activities such as laboratories and student rotations, (3) service on qualifying, general and final examination committees, (4) advising the research of students enrolled in the professional schools or colleges of The Ohio State University, and (5) participation in graduate forums, seminars, reviews, etc.
7. Active participation as a mentor in training grants such as NIH T32 or K-awards F31, F32 or other mentored fellowship awards for graduate students or postdoctoral fellows is highly valued as a teaching and mentoring activity.

## C. Service

Service includes administrative service to OSU, program development, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University. An Assistant Professor's service

must include the following:

1. Membership and service on a minimum of one faculty committee, preferably within the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology, for at least three years.
2. Participation in at least one College or University committee.
3. Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline including committee membership or leadership in professional societies, multiple ad hoc journal reviews or proposal reviews for national professional societies and/or **NIH**.

**Application of Guidelines:**

- A. These guidelines will be effective whenever the APT is revised or reaffirmed by vote of the departmental faculty.
- B. These guidelines will apply, without reservation, to all Assistant Professors whose date of appointment in rank is not more than two years prior to the effective date of the guidelines.
- C. In evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion and tenure, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against light commitments and responsibilities in another. In this circumstance, the candidate will be responsible for presenting a credible case for application of flexibility.

**PROMOTION TO RANK OF PROFESSOR**

**Criteria:**

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 and internationally or positions of national leadership. The promotion to Professor is not automatic, nor dependent on the number of years of service. Promotion in rank from Associate Professor to Professor will be considered in any year with no regard to any minimum period of time while in rank as Associate Professor. The following guidelines are general in nature and are intended to serve as a minimum range of criteria in the categories of research, teaching and service that the candidate should achieve before application for promotion to Professor. The academic achievements of the candidate for his/her entire career will be considered, with focus on the professional development of the candidate since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. In evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. Scholarship, as manifested by communication of scientific discovery through publications and presentations, is the

most important general criterion for promotion. Metric evidence that the candidate has a sustained, eminent record of achievement recognized nationally and internationally can be demonstrated by accomplishment of key scholarly achievements as exemplified in the following:

A. Research:

1. Having produced a significant body of Scholarship, consisting of a minimum of 25 peer-reviewed manuscripts published in recognized scientific journals (e.g., listings in *Index Medicus*) or equivalent media with at least 12 as senior author while in the rank as Associate Professor. The journals in which these papers are published should have a mean impact factor of 3 - 6.
2. Evidence of continued scholarship and overall impact since appointment to Associate Professor, such as a total of at least 50 peer-reviewed publications over the professional career, clear evidence of increasing citations and journal impact factors and citation half-life indices, and/or an Hirsch Index (H-Index) value of 25 or more.
3. Invention disclosures, income-producing, patent awards and licensing recognizable as scholarly activities and equivalencies to traditional publications.
4. Evidence of a national and international reputation for expertise in a focused field and thematic area of research, including invited seminars at institutions outside of The Ohio State University, presentation of state-of-the-art lectures at national and international scientific meetings and publication of peer-reviewed review articles and expert commentary on the status of specialized areas of a particular field of research.
5. Established and maintained a sustained record of continued funding as Principal Investigator on multiple competitively reviewed grants from US Government agencies (e.g., National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation) while in rank as Associate Professor, include designation as Principal investigator on an ongoing funded R01 or equivalent, plus a second significant grant as Principal Investigator, Dual Principal investigator, or PD on a P01 or equivalent type of NIH-funded grant award.
6. Participation as Co-Principal Investigator on grants, as well as research funding from industry and state or local societies are positive factors that will receive consideration in the overall evaluation of quality and quantity of research productivity.
7. Other applicable aspects of the candidates overall range of achievement in research will include, but not be limited to:
  - Awards and recognition for excellence in research
  - Additional publications of any type
  - Additional abstracts and presentations at scientific meetings
  - Supervision of postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars

## B. Teaching

1. All members of the faculty shall participate in the Department's teaching effort and shall carry out their duties in a highly professional and competent manner. Neither the quantity nor quality of teaching, by themselves, shall normally be considered as sufficient grounds for promotion to Professor; a lack of teaching and/or poor quality teaching may, however, be grounds for denial or delay in promotion to Professor. The nature of what constitutes a fair share of the instructional effort is best left to the department Chair, in consultation with appropriate Departmental committees, e.g., Curriculum, Merit, P&T. Evaluation of the volume of the candidate's teaching commitment will be balanced by the amount of documented release time (i.e., percent effort) committed to  
extramural-funded research since appointment at the rank of Associate Professor.
2. Demonstration of level of quality in the performance of teaching requires documentation by at least three of the following:
  - A. Quantitative evidence of quality derived from student evaluations and subjective comments obtained from students and postdoctoral trainees. All forms of teaching evaluation must be validated by the departmental P&T Committee.
  - B. Evidence of consistently positive teaching within or outside of the College of Medicine as determined by evaluations made by faculty peers.
  - C. Receipt of a competitive college or university award for teaching.
  - D. Awards secured as a mentor for training grants such as NIH T31, T32 or K-awards F31, F32 or other nationally recognized mentored fellowship awards for graduate students or postdoctoral fellows.
  - E. Mentorship of junior faculty by serving on a junior faculty advisory committee, as evidenced by providing a mentees' evaluation.
3. Demonstration of a body of mentorship by guiding students to successful completion of the Doctoral of Philosophy Degree and/or guiding post-docs to a successful academic career during the faculty member's academic career at The Ohio State University.
4. Advised, assisted and/or examined additional graduate, medical and/or undergraduate students.

## C. Service:

Evidence of leadership in policy decisions of the Department, College, University and/or National/International biomedical organizations should be apparent before advancement to Professor. National/international service may not substitute for contributions to the intramural community. Service requirements may be met by the following service expectations:

1. Participation and Leadership of at least one Departmental Committee

2. Participation on University and/or College Committees.
3. Leadership role in a national and/or International professional society recognized by experts in the candidate's field of study.
4. NIH study section or equivalent federal panel membership and/or multiple ad hoc participations in NIH study sections and/or national or international society committees.
5. Journal editorial board membership and/or a sustained record of ad-hoc review for top tier journals in the field.

### **Application of Guidelines:**

- A. These guidelines will be effective on the date of acceptance by vote (two-thirds majority required) of the departmental faculty.
- B. These guidelines will apply, without reservation, to all Associate Professors whose date of appointment in rank is not more than two years prior to the effective date of the guidelines.

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against light commitments and responsibilities in another. In this circumstance, the candidate will be responsible for presenting a credible case for application of flexibility. These guidelines will be effective whenever the APT is revised or reaffirmed by vote of the departmental faculty

### **PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS**

- A. The Promotion and Tenure Committee Structure and Composition.
  1. The AP&T Committee shall consist of five elected faculty members serving three-year staggered terms (two members added per year). Two new members shall be elected via secret ballot in May each year. The membership shall be restricted to tenured faculty only, but all eligible faculty may vote on committee composition. The committee shall have two officers (chair and secretary) elected by the members of the AP&T Committee and serving one-year terms. The organizational meeting of the newly constituted committee shall take place in June, which shall mark the term of office of the new committee. The retiring chair shall convene the organizational meeting at which time new officers will be elected. The schedule for upcoming promotion reviews (if any) and annual reviews of probationary faculty shall be reviewed and future meetings scheduled
  2. Duties of chair of the P&T Committee shall include: (a) calling meetings with due notice to members, (b) appointing the Procedures Oversight Designee for any promotion or promotion and tenure reviews, and (c) delivery of the most recent copy of "Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure of Faculty" (i.e., the guidelines for the preparation of the dossier) to all candidates seeking

promotion or promotion or tenure as soon as it becomes available from the Office of Academic Affairs (usually early in spring semester).

3. Duties of the secretary include: (a) taking the minutes of all the meetings, (b) filing a copy of the approved minutes with the departmental secretary, and (c) serving as acting chair in the absence of the elected chair for meetings that cannot be postponed due to imminent deadlines.
4. Duties of the Procedures Oversight Designee. The Procedures Oversight Designee replaces the Affirmative Action Designee and has that position's responsibilities as well as others. The Oversight Designee should assure that the review body at each level follows the written procedures governing P&T reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review. The Oversight Designee also has the responsibility to ensure that all procedures have appropriately been followed for all faculty under review not only faculty from underrepresented groups. The Procedures Oversight Designee fills out the "Checklist for Tenure Initiating Unit Procedures Oversight Designee" form. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review should first be brought to the attention of the relevant review body. If they cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the Procedures Oversight Designee, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (Chair, Dean or Provost, depending on the level of the review). That individual must look into the matter and provide a response to the designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is judged not to be warranted.

**Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of the review bodies must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias for all faculty members under review.**

- B. Duties of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
1. The P&T Committee shall review all candidates for appointment in the Department. A summary report will be presented during the next scheduled faculty meeting. After appropriate discussion, a vote will be taken of all faculty present at this meeting.
  2. The P&T Committee will review all candidates for promotion or promotion and tenure.
    - a. The faculty member has primary responsibility for preparing the dossier for promotion according to Office of Academic Affairs guidelines.
    - b. The P&T Committee shall review the dossier and draft a written evaluation of

the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The final dossier, along with the written evaluation by the P&T Committee, will be available in the departmental Chair's office for review by all eligible faculty (faculty of higher rank than the candidate).

- c. The departmental Chair shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and recommendation to the dean for inclusion in the dossier.
3. The P&T Committee shall participate in an orientation meeting with all newly appointed faculty to inform them about appointments, promotion, and tenure guidelines.
- C. Procedure for the review process.
1. Departmental review normally takes place in October or November. Any resulting promotion becomes effective the following September.
  2. A review for an individual Associate Professor will be made upon specific request by:
    - a. The Chair of the Department.
    - b. A member of the P&T Committee.
    - c. The individual faculty member.

The individual will be duly notified to bring up-to-date all pertinent files and curriculum vitae information including reprints and documentation of teaching effectiveness. A written report will be made.

- D. Comments process on promotion and tenure and promotion at the Departmental level.

According to Faculty Rule [3335-6-04\(6\)\(5\)](#), as soon as the faculty report and the Chair's letter have been completed, the candidate should be notified in writing of the completion of the tenure initiating unit review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the department Chair with written comments on the departmental review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The P&T Committee and/or chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.

- E. Comments process on promotion and tenure and promotion at College level.

*According to Faculty Rule [3335-6-04\(C\)\(2\)](#), as soon as the college promotion and tenure committee report and dean's letter have been completed, the candidate should be notified in writing of the completion of the college level review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the dean with written comments on the college review*

*for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The college promotion and tenure committee and/or dean may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the college level review is permitted. The dean shall forward the dossier, along with all evaluations and reports, to the Executive Vice President and Provost.*

## **DOCUMENTATION OF DOSSIER FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

The candidate shall be given the most recent copy of the guidelines for the preparation of the dossier as soon it becomes available from the Office of Academic Affairs. The **candidate is responsible for providing all the information requested and preparing the dossier in the proper format.**

## **APPEALS**

Appeals of negative promotion or promotion and tenure decisions

According to Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) (A) a candidate may appeal any negative promotion or promotion and tenure decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on allegation of improper evaluation are described in rule [3335-5-05](#) of the Administrative Code.

## **SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS**

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

Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, a tenure initiating unit may petition the dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the unit and the chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions of the seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the dean concurs with the tenure initiating unit's petition, the dean shall in turn petition the provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in non-

renewal of the appointment. The conduct of the seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of appointment is that stated in the letter of non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by his or her tenure initiating unit, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review.

## Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.

### 1. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty rule [3335-3-35](#) requires that each department guarantee that students shall be given the opportunity to evaluate each course and every instructor every time a given course is offered. A standardized student evaluation of instruction (SEI) form will be used in each course. A copy of a Summary of SEIs must be included as part of his/her promotion and tenure dossier. As per University policy, a faculty member may supplement the standardized SEI form with an instrument of his/her design.

### 2. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

- A. The Junior Advisory Committee (selected by candidates) shall provide an annual peer evaluation of teaching for each probationary faculty member. In a similar manner, the department chair shall appoint a peer review group to evaluate the teaching performance of tenured faculty members seeking promotion. This group shall consist of at least two tenured faculty members. This review will occur at least two years before a request for promotion is anticipated.
- B. At the beginning of the autumn semester the department chair will meet with the candidate to select the appropriate course or a series of teaching activities to be evaluated. The Peer Review of Teaching Committee will then meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation procedure and to review the course/teaching activities documentation. Documentation should include: syllabus and course materials. Each review committee member will observe the classroom teaching at least twice (this would typically result in four total observations of teaching). Review committee members do not need to observe on the same day and do not need to alert the candidate of their intended visit. The candidate should, however, advise the committee members as to times when observation would not be productive, such as days of exams, guest speakers, and so forth. Classroom observation should be evaluated using a standardized list of criteria as in the attached appendix (Appendix A, "Points to consider in the Peer Evaluation of Teaching"). After completion of the observation of the classroom teaching, the committee will prepare a written report. This report will be given to the instructor evaluated and a copy will also be included as part of the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The candidate has the option to include a written response to the review in his/her dossier.
- C. The responsibilities of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:
  1. to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty at least once per semester during the first two years of service, and at least twice per

year during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year

2. to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate professors at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three year period
3. to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review
4. To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
5. To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching ([www.ucat.osu.edu](http://www.ucat.osu.edu)).

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the 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. See appendix A for more detail.

## **Appendix A**

### **POINTS TO CONSIDER IN THE PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR DOSSIERS**

***Points to consider in the evaluation of teaching materials.*** The following criteria are to be used as guidelines for evaluating teaching materials. It should be recognized that not all times will apply to all situations. The peer review committee and candidate should select those items that are appropriate for a particular situation. A five-point rating scale may be used to help the reviewer evaluate materials. An overall score is not a part of

the review process.

## SYLLABUS

Completeness: Does it have each of the following?

- course information
- instructor information
- information on course readings
- \_goals and objectives of course
- \_policies on grading, academic misconduct, late work, absences
- calendar of class activities
- \_Description of assignments/due dates

Clarity of Communication: Is syllabus clear? Are rights, responsibilities and consequences spelled out?

Appropriateness of Tone: Does the syllabus further rapport and respect between instructor and students? Does it communicate a helpful positive motivational, non-threatening but challenging attitude?

Appropriateness of Content: Is the content covered in the course reflective of the course objectives? Is the content covered in a logical order?

Currency of Content: Does the course content portray the current state of the field? Does it use readings that reflect the latest scholarship?

Level of Challenge: Does the course require students to do an appropriate amount of reading and assignments at an appropriate level?

Pacing: Is the course calendar realistic? Has the instructor selected a reasonable amount of content for the time allotted? Are the dates for assignments distributed well?

Testing and Grading: Do the students receive frequent feedback? Are the grading policies fair and appropriate for the goals?

Student-Centeredness: Do the office hours or other information portray that the instructor is accessible for help? Are other resources available for the student? Do the activities show a concern for active student engagement?

COURSE PACKET AND  
TEXTBOOK ASSESSMENT

Match with goals of course  
Contain accurate content  
Most current source  
Present multiple viewpoints  
Appropriate level of interest  
Appropriate reading level  
Visually attractive  
Appropriate amount of reading  
Clearly organized  
User friendly

#### **COURSE HANDOUTS**

Supplement course content  
Contain accurate content  
Appropriate reading level  
Adequate level of detail  
Demonstrate instructional skills  
Show creativity

#### **MULTIMEDIA COURSE MATERIALS**

Match with goals/objectives of course  
Accuracy of content  
Currency of content  
Production quality  
Interest level  
Attractiveness  
Appropriate length  
Appropriate level of difficulty  
Clarity of organization  
User friendly  
Permit interactivity  
Permit self-pacing  
Provide branching options  
Provide user feedback  
Provide for students with special needs

#### **TESTS**

Clarity of directions  
Test items match course objectives  
Legibility and Layout  
Appropriate length  
Clarity of test items

Standards for grading clearly specified  
Appropriate level of challenge  
Inclusion of higher order thinking  
Organization of content

#### **CLASS ASSIGNMENTS/EXERCISE SHEETS**

Supplement course content  
Match objectives of course  
Provide clear directions  
Provide a meaningful learning experience  
Appropriate level of challenge  
Outline assessment method  
Clearly state purpose  
Demonstrate instructor creativity  
Promote student engagement (active learning)  
Adequate time/resources for completion

#### **OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS ABOUT TEACHING MATERIALS**

What aspects of the instructor's teaching materials clearly stood out as effective in facilitating student learning?  
What recommendations do you have that might aid in improving the instructor's teaching materials?

#### **EXTENSION PLAN**

The audience is clearly identified  
Examples of appropriate teaching situations are provided  
Overall objectives are identified  
Behavioral objectives are specified  
Plan is practical  
Limitations for use of materials are specified  
Plan is arranged in logical order  
Time line is practical  
Plan is flexible

Complete list of resources needed -  
with educational materials is  
provided

If part of a large program -  
relationship is explained

#### EXTENSION EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

Difficulty level of material is  
appropriate for audience

Topic is important

Content matches stated objectives

Content is accurate

Content is up-to-date

Presentation method fits audience

Content is sufficiently in depth  
Appropriate balance between major  
points

Appropriate form or design of  
material for subject matter

Materials are appealing to eye/ear

Written/audio materials are clear and  
concise

Information is presented in logical  
order

Quality of materials is professional

"Non-original" materials are  
appropriate for stated  
objectives

***Points to consider in the observation of classroom teaching.*** The following checklist and comment questions are guidelines to be used when evaluating classroom performance. Not all items will apply or be observed in every observation experience. These items are to be used as illustrations of good teaching behavior. A five-point rating scale may be used to help the reviewer evaluate materials. An overall score is not a part of the review process.

#### INSTRUCTOR ORGANIZATION

Arrives for class on time  
States relation of class to previous one or larger program  
Knows how to use technology as needed  
States or posts objectives  
Provides outline for class lesson  
Makes transitional statements between segments  
Conveys purpose of each class activity  
Summarizes periodically  
Completes topics scheduled for the class  
Remains focused on objectives  
Keeps an appropriate pace

#### PRESENTATION SKILLS

An effective speaker  
Employs appropriate rate of speech  
Uses classroom space well  
Enthusiastic about subject matter  
Command of English was adequate  
Voice is audible  
Varies tone/pitch of voice  
Avoids distracting mannerisms  
Maintains eye contact  
Avoids extensive reading from notes or texts  
Uses "note-taking" pace

#### INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Uses more than one form of instruction  
Uses appropriate teaching techniques for stated goals  
Pauses after asking questions  
Prevents specific students from dominating discussion  
Draws non-participants into discussions  
Helps students to extend their responses  
Mediates conflicts or differences of opinion  
Maps the direction of the discussion  
Provides opportunity for active learning  
Provides explicit directions for active learning tasks  
Specifies how active learning will be evaluated  
Allows enough time to complete active learning task

Facilitates group work well

Helps students learn from each other

Helps students apply theory to solve problems

Develops awareness of process used to gain new knowledge

#### CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Knowledgeable of subject matter

Information is accurate

Incorporates current research

Identifies sources, authorities in the field

Communicates reasoning process behind operations/concepts

Confident in explaining subject matter

Focuses on important content in the field

Demonstrates curiosity toward new ideas or perspectives

Incorporates diverse views (such as gender, culture, race, age) Corrects racist or sexist bias in assigned materials

#### CLARITY

Explains subject matter clearly

Logically organizes presentation

Considers diverse learning styles by using multiple approaches. e.g. overheads, handouts, discussion, visuals

Pitches instruction at an appropriate level

Responds to questions clearly

Emphasizes major points

Relates material to practical situations/uses examples to explain

Defines new terms or concepts

Elaborates or repeats complex information

Pauses to allow students to ask questions

#### RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

Welcomes student participation

Motivates students

Demonstrates sense of humor

Uses effective classroom management techniques

Flexible in responding to student concerns

Welcomes multiple perspectives

Treats students impartially

Respects constructive criticism

Able to help many kinds of students

Sensitive to individual interests and abilities

Does not express sexist or racist attitudes

Addresses students by name

Attends to student comprehension or puzzlement

Uses positive reinforcement

Incorporates student ideas into class

## INSTRUCTION IN LABS, STUDIOS, OR FIELD SETTINGS

Experiments/exercises are well chosen and well organized

Procedures/techniques are clearly  
explained/demonstrated

Thoroughly familiar with experiments,  
exercises, equipment, tools

Available for assistance during experiments/exercises

Experiments/exercises are of appropriate level of difficulty

Experiments/exercises develop important skills

Experiments/exercises develop confidence in subject matter

Safety is emphasized

Criticism of procedures/techniques is constructive

Provides aid with interpretation of data

Clinical or field experiences are realistic

## OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

Describe several strengths evident in the instructors teaching performance.

What suggestions do you have that might aid in improving the instructors overall teaching effectiveness?