

# **APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Guidelines, Criteria and Procedures for the College of Pharmacy

College of Pharmacy  
The Ohio State University  
500 W. 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Approved by the College of Pharmacy Regular Faculty on July 3, 1997;  
Revised June 7, 1999; October 1, 1999; December 13, 1999; May 4, 2001;  
June 4, 2004; June 3, 2005; May 12, 2006; June 1, 2012; January 9, 2015;  
November 13, 2015

Approved by Office of Academic Affairs, April 18, 2016

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This document is based on the following other documents:

1. "Standards and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Review in The College of Pharmacy," College of Pharmacy, The Ohio State University, adopted June 12, 1985.
2. "Standards and Procedures for Review and Promotion of Regular Clinical Faculty," College of Pharmacy, The Ohio State University, adopted June 4, 1993.
3. Chapter 3335-6 and 3335-7 Additional Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure.
4. Appointments, Promotion and Tenure, Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Classics.

Document No. 1 acknowledged the following:

1. Memorandum on "Promotion/Tenure of Regular Faculty," Office of Academic Affairs, October 15, 1980, September 16, 1982 and September 5, 1984.
2. Memorandum on "Statement of Criteria for Granting Tenure and Promotion," Committee on Tenure and Promotion, College of Pharmacy, The Ohio State University, March 10, 1975 and September 19, 1978.
3. Memoranda on "Procedure Guidelines," Committee on Tenure and Promotion, College of Pharmacy, The Ohio State University, September 24, 1982, and October 5, 1982.
4. "Guidelines for Promotion of Clinical Faculty," College of Pharmacy, The Ohio State University, July 1, 1983 and October 18, 1983.
5. "Standards and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Review," College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, February 25, 1982.
6. "Statement on Faculty Retention and Promotion," Department of History, Spring, 1984.
7. "A Proposed System for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure in the College of Medicine," College of Medicine, The Ohio State University, 1983.

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College of Pharmacy and the Office of Academic Affairs (see cover page for date of approval).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SUMMARY OF P&amp;T PROCEDURES.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. PREAMBLE.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>II. COLLEGE MISSION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>III. DEFINITIONS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1. Tenure-Track Faculty .....	6
2. Clinical Faculty .....	6
3. ....	
4. ....	
5. Research Faculty .....	6
6. Conflict of Interest .....	7
7. Minimum Composition .....	7
<b>B. Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>C. Quorum .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1. Appointment .....	8
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal....	8
<b>IV. APPOINTMENTS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>A. Criteria .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1. Tenure-Track Faculty .....	8
2. Clinical Faculty .....	10
3. Research Faculty .....	11
4. Associated Faculty .....	11
5. Courtesy Faculty Appointments.....	13
<b>B. Procedures .....</b>	<b>13</b>
1. Tenure-Track Faculty .....	13
2. Clinical Faculty .....	15
3. Research Faculty .....	16
4. Transfer from the Tenure-Track Faculty .....	16
5. Associated Faculty .....	16
6. Courtesy Faculty Appointments.....	16
<b>V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>A. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty .....</b>	<b>17</b>
1. Fourth-Year Review .....	18
2. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period .....	19
<b>B. Tenured Faculty .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>C. Clinical Faculty .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>D. Research Faculty .....</b>	<b>20</b>

<b>E. Associated Faculty .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASE AND OTHER REWARDS .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>A. Criteria .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>B. Procedures .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>C. Documentation .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>A. Criteria .....</b>	<b>22</b>
1. Tenure-Track Faculty .....	22
2. Clinical Faculty .....	24
3. Research Faculty .....	26
4. Associated Faculty .....	26
<b>B. Procedures .....</b>	<b>29</b>
1. Candidate Responsibilities .....	29
2. Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities .....	29
3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities .....	31
4. Division Chair Responsibilities .....	31
5. Responsibilities of the College Dean .....	32
6. External Evaluations .....	33
<b>C. Documentation .....</b>	<b>34</b>
1. Teaching .....	34
2. Research and Scholarship .....	35
3. Service and Professional Practice .....	35
4. Health Care (if Applicable) .....	36
5. Associated Faculty .....	37
<b>VIII. APPEALS .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>A. Student Evaluation of Teaching .....</b>	<b>39</b>
1. Student Evaluation .....	39
2. Other Teaching .....	39
<b>B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....</b>	<b>41</b>
1. Peer Evaluation .....	41
<b>XI. REVISION .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>XII. SAMPLE DOCUMENTS .....</b>	<b>44</b>
Form letter for request of evaluation from outside evaluator of faculty .....	44
Form letter for request of evaluation from outside evaluator of clinical faculty .....	45
Ballot .....	46

Faculty Review Form .....47

## I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the college of pharmacy and the university. Should those rules and policies change, the college shall follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the dean.

This document must be approved by the dean of the college of pharmacy and the provost of the university before it can be implemented. It sets forth the mission of the college, and in the context of that mission and the mission of the 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 college and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in the following Faculty Rule:

*3335-6-01 General considerations.*

- (A) *Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure (except when the provisions of paragraph (H) of rule 3335-6-03 are invoked.) Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance--normally tenure initiating unit colleagues. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes, to exercise the standards established in faculty rule 3335-6-02 of the Administrative Code and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in faculty rule 3335-6-02 of the Administrative Code and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, or promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reasons that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence.*

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

## **II. COLLEGE MISSION**

The Ohio State University College of Pharmacy advances the pharmacy profession and patient-centered care across Ohio and around the globe through innovative teaching and practice, ground-breaking research, and transformative outreach and engagement.

## **III. DEFINITIONS**

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

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

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

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

#### **2. Clinical Faculty**

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

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

#### **3. Research Faculty**

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of research faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the college, all clinical faculty whose

primary appointment is in the college, and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the college. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

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

#### **4. Conflict of Interest**

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., as 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 or appointment will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

#### **5. Minimum Composition**

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

### **B. Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The college of pharmacy has an Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of four professors. The committee's membership is appointed by the dean, and the chair is chosen by election from among the members of the committee. The term of service is two years, with reappointment possible.

### **C. Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds (67.7%) of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the dean has approved an off-campus assignment. Eligible faculty unable to attend in person may participate via the telephone, and should convey their vote to Chair of the APT Committee immediately after the meeting.

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

#### **D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

##### **1. Appointment**

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

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

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

## **IV. APPOINTMENTS**

### **A. Criteria**

The college of pharmacy will make only those faculty appointments that enhance or have the potential to enhance the quality of the college and its effectiveness in pursuing its mission. Since the college expects that its senior tenure-track faculty members will be respected scholars within their areas of research and that junior members will be persons who have reasonable promise of achieving that status, excellence in scholarship is, therefore, a necessary condition for appointment or promotion to any continuing tenure-track position. For clinical track faculty, excellence in provision of direct or indirect health care is a necessary condition for continuing appointment or promotion. Since the college expects excellence in teaching from all of its members as part of its mission, entry-level appointments will require evidence of potential as effective teachers and senior appointments will require evidence of effectiveness in the classroom and in other educational forums.

#### **1. Tenure-Track Faculty**

##### **a) Instructor**

An appointment to the rank of instructor should normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. The appointment is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the division's eligible faculty, the division chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

#### **b) Assistant Professor**

The minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, or equivalent education and experience, and the promise both of a strong research profile and the ability to advance through the ranks. The candidate should demonstrate, either in the dissertation or in published material, the potential for significant published contributions to scholarship in his or her field and should demonstrate potential or ability as an effective teacher.

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is 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. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

#### **c) Professor or Associate Professor**

An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure, unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves a probationary period. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Candidates being considered for appointment at senior rank must meet the criteria for promotion to that rank. A

probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

## **2. Clinical Faculty**

Appointment of clinical faculty entails a three-, four- or five-year contract. The initial appointment for clinical faculty is always probationary. By the end of the second to final year of the probationary appointment, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. In consideration of a contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information, see Faculty Rule 3335-7.

### **a) Instructor of Clinical Pharmacy**

Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The college of pharmacy will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to four years. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

### **b) Assistant Professor of Clinical Pharmacy**

The minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor of clinical pharmacy is an earned doctorate or equivalent experience and the promise of developing and maintaining excellence in the delivery of direct or indirect health care and in teaching. The candidate should demonstrate the potential for scholarship and service, and an ability to progress through the ranks.

### **c) Professor or Associate Professor of Clinical Pharmacy**

Appointment at the rank of associate professor of clinical pharmacy or professor of clinical pharmacy requires that the individual have a doctorate or equivalent experience and meet, at a minimum, the college of pharmacy's

criteria for promotion to these ranks, in terms of teaching, professional practice and other service, and research and scholarship.

### **3. Research Faculty**

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

#### **a) Research Assistant Professor**

Initial appointments or transfers to becoming a research faculty member require an earned doctorate in the relevant field. At the time of the appointment as a research assistant professor, the individual should already have demonstrated significant experience and/or potential for a productive research career, as shown by the quality of the Ph.D. dissertation or equivalent, research articles in preparation, already published work, research presentations at meetings, and evidence from postdoctoral work (which is highly recommended). Appointment of a candidate who does not hold a Ph.D. degree requires evidence of sufficient research experience and publications to suggest that the candidate will be able to pursue an independent course of research.

#### **b) Research Associate Professor and Research Professor**

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

### **4. Associated Faculty**

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple of weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. With the exception of visiting faculty, associated faculty may be reappointed.

#### **a) Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor**

Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the college of pharmacy, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

**b) Clinical Instructor of Pharmacy Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor of Pharmacy Practice, Clinical Associate Professor of Pharmacy Practice, Clinical Professor of Pharmacy Practice**

Associated clinical appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Uncompensated appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated academic service to the college of pharmacy, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Associated clinical rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of clinical faculty. Associated clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of clinical faculty.

**c) Lecturer**

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

**d) Senior Lecturer**

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

**e) Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%**

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

**f) Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor**

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

## **5. Courtesy Faculty Appointments**

Occasionally, the active academic involvement in this college by a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in the college of pharmacy. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

## **B. Procedures**

### **1. Tenure-Track Faculty**

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of A Guide to Effective Searches ([www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf](http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf)).

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) for information on the following topics:

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

After the dean has approved a search to fill a tenure-track position, the division faculty will approve a position description. The division chair will appoint a search committee, which will solicit applications broadly and by a variety of means, including advertisements in appropriate journals and newsletters of professional organizations, requests to colleagues asking for nominations, and invitations to potential highly qualified and desirable candidates. Special attention will be paid to the college diversity plan during the search to increase the numbers of qualified underrepresented applicants. The search committee will solicit letters of evaluation from references provided by the candidate and will seek external evaluation from others as appropriate. The search committee will also develop and implement a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise via at least one 30-day online advertisement in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency (with

evidence required through holding a "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 has included an advertisement in a field-specific national professional journal.

After evaluation of information regarding the qualifications of all the applicants, the search committee will recommend to the division faculty the top candidates and indicate those who should be invited for on-campus interviews. After discussion of the search committee recommendation and approval by a majority of the division faculty, candidates will be invited for an interview. The interview will involve full participation by the division faculty and the Executive Committee, and participation by graduate and professional students will be sought as appropriate. Division faculty will meet to discuss the results of the interviews and to select and rank acceptable candidates. The list of acceptable candidates will be forwarded to the dean. Upon approval by the dean, the division chair and the dean will negotiate the terms of the appointment with the candidate.

When the appointment does involve tenure or when the candidate will be appointed at a more senior rank than he or she currently holds, the eligible faculty of the college must review the appointment in the spirit of Section VI. The candidate shall meet the qualifications for the proposed rank that are described in Section VII.A through Section VII.D. The review of the candidate will be coordinated by the promotion and tenure committee with the support of the dean's office. The following guidelines will be followed:

- a)** When the candidate will be appointed to a position analogous to that which he or she currently holds, e.g., a currently tenured associate professor is to be appointed as associate professor with tenure at Ohio State, the documentation may consist of the materials gathered during the selection process. The salient parts of the dossier core, as described in the most recent version of *Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure* (Office of Academic Affairs) should be present. These parts include a list of courses taught, teaching evaluations (student and peer as available), graduate students directed, a list of published work, and a list of current and past research funding. Outside candidates being considered for appointment at senior rank do not need to submit a complete dossier. A full CV is sufficient although the college may request additional information. The candidate should supply any missing items. In addition to the letters of recommendation obtained as part of the selection process, the division chair will obtain letters of evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work from appropriately qualified outside evaluators, who should be selected by the chair in consultation with eligible division faculty.

**b)** When the appointment is to a rank above that currently held by the candidate or when the appointment will be with tenure and the candidate is currently untenured, evaluation letters from at least five outside evaluators must be obtained. The candidate should prepare a dossier as described in the OAA's most recent version of *Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure*. It is recognized that in certain competitive circumstances it will be necessary to react rather quickly. Outside candidates being considered for appointment at senior rank do not need to submit a complete dossier. A full CV is sufficient though the college may request additional information. The APT Committee should be consulted by the division chair and the dean regarding approaches that may be used to streamline the collection of documentation so that as much relevant information can be assembled in a time frame appropriate to the particular situation.

**c)** The division chair should prepare a letter that evaluates the quality of academic performance and effectiveness of the candidate in the defined area of faculty responsibilities; i.e., teaching, research, professional competence, and service. To assist the writing of the evaluation letter, the chair shall obtain input from all eligible division faculty members (including clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate when clinical faculty are considered). However, since each participant will have only one vote in the process, at the ballot meeting, no faculty votes are to be conducted at the division level.

**d)** The documentation will be checked by the procedures oversight designee (POD) of the APT Committee to ensure that it contains the required information, meets with procedural requirements, and that publications and grants listed in the dossier have been verified.

**e)** The documentation of the candidate will be made available to eligible faculty for at least five working days before a "ballot meeting" of eligible faculty is convened by the APT Committee. The meeting will be conducted as described in Section VII.

**f)** The final tally for each candidate will be determined by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and reported to the Dean of the college of pharmacy in a letter from the APT committee. The committee's letter should also summarize the sense of the faculty and the rationale for the outcome of the vote. The letter should provide the eligible faculty's assessment of quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service.

**g)** All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

## **2. Clinical Faculty**

The same procedure as described for tenure-track faculty will be followed. Exceptions to conducting a national search only requires approval by the dean.

## **3. Research Faculty**

The same procedure as described for tenure-track faculty will be followed. Exceptions to conducting a national search only requires approval by the dean.

## **4. Transfer from the Tenure-Track Faculty**

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

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

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

## **5. Associated Faculty**

### **a) Non-Clinical Practice Associated Faculty**

Appointment will be initiated at the division level. A candidate may be recommended to the division chair by a member of the division faculty or the candidate may request that he or she be considered for appointment. The division faculty must approve the appointment by a simple majority vote, which may be preceded by an interview and seminar by the candidate. Upon approval by the division faculty and by the chair of the division, the candidate will be recommended to the dean for appointment.

### **b) Clinical Practice Associated Faculty**

The candidate should submit a curriculum vitae along with either a written request for appointment or a letter of recommendation for appointment by the experiential site preceptor coordinator for the pharmacy site. The request for initial appointment should be sent to the director of professional experience programs. Initial appointment to titles of clinical instructor of practice and clinical assistant professor of practice require the approval of, and are processed by, the chair of appropriate division. Approved candidates are recommended to the dean's designee for initial appointment. Appointments to clinical associate professor of practice and clinical professor of practice titles require approval by a majority of the faculty of the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Administration.

## **6. Courtesy Faculty Appointments**

The candidate is nominated for appointment by a member of the division faculty, who provides the rationale for the appointment. The nomination is discussed at a meeting of division faculty and the appointment requires a majority vote of the division faculty. Faculty may request that the candidate present a seminar to the division as a part of the review for appointment. Upon approval by the division faculty and by the chair of the division, the candidate will be recommended to the Executive Committee for appointment. The approval of the candidate's tenure initiating unit (TIU) is also required. Division faculty should review periodically the courtesy faculty of the division. The appointments of faculty who cease to contribute substantially to the mission of the college should be terminated.

## **V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES**

### **A. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty<sup>1</sup>**

These procedures are consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 as well as with Office of Academic Affairs policies described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>). Below is relevant material from the Faculty Rules:

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

**a)** Faculty members under review are responsible for providing an appropriate Faculty Activity Statement and appropriate materials for review. The Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline must be used. The division chair and the tenured faculty may solicit or provide additional information that they consider relevant.

**b)** All tenured faculty of the division will be consulted during the annual review, either at a faculty meeting set for the review or through other means when any tenured faculty member cannot be present at the meeting. It is the chair's responsibility to contact all tenured faculty members and to solicit input from them. Any tenured faculty member who cannot attend the review meeting may submit input.<sup>2</sup> The chair will summarize the deliberations in the

---

<sup>1</sup> (C) Annual review of probationary tenure-track faculty members is further detailed in Faculty Rule 3335-6\_XX.

<sup>2</sup>Typically this will apply to faculty who are out of town or who cannot attend for various reasons. It is understood that faculty who can attend have a responsibility to participate fully in these discussions.

annual review letter to the candidate (see Section VII of this document). Whenever the faculty evaluation is divided the chair will invite the submission of written dissenting opinions so that he or she may create one report to the dean, which covers all points of view.

**c)** The dean will review the candidate's activity statement and the annual review letter of the division chair. The dean may write a separate letter of evaluation of the candidate, or may endorse the letter from the division. The annual review of probationary faculty should be completed by the end of spring semester. If the outcome of the annual review, other than the fourth-year review, is negative and the dean decides that no renewal of the appointment is warranted, a formal performance review that employs fourth-year review procedures will be undertaken during the ensuing semester, as set forth in Section V.A.1 below of this document. If the outcome of the formal performance review is negative, the case will be forwarded to the provost for review during the following January; the provost makes the final decision regarding reappointment. Notification of non-renewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in 3335-6-08 of the Rules of the University Faculty. The fourth-year review procedure subsequent to a non-renewal decision should be completed by the end of summer semester that follows the annual review.

**d)** Regardless of the outcome, the candidate will be invited to review the letters of the division chair and the dean. The candidate may comment in writing on the letters and the review. The division chair and the dean must respond in writing to the comments, within 10 working days of their receipt, but the process ends there.

**e)** In cases of differing assessments when there is a recommendation for reappointment the dean will attempt to resolve conflicting evaluations in a way that both advises the faculty member of those areas where his or her record is open to question and provides candid and clear advice about aspects of performance that need improvement.

**f)** The dean will notify the probationary faculty member in writing of a decision for non-renewal and of university appeal procedures. The letter shall supply to the faculty member the reasons for non-renewal. When the dean's decision against renewal of the appointment opposes a recommendation by division or college faculty to renew the appointment, the dean shall explain his or her disagreement to the faculty in writing.

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

The fourth-year review of probationary faculty follows the same process as the review for tenure and promotion, with the exception that outside letters of evaluation are not usually requested. Renewal of the appointment of a

probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the dean of the college. Since the college has only one level of review, all annual reviews of probationary faculty that lead to a non-renewal decision are reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs and the provost is the final decision maker. The fourth-year review of probationary faculty should be completed by the end of fall semester and submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs by the January deadline.

## **2. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Periods**

(The previous subsections 2 a) through 2f) have been deleted.)

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

### **B. Tenured Faculty**

Each year, each member of the tenured faculty will provide the division chair with a Faculty Activity Statement (FAS) summarizing recent professional activities. The college has a standard format for the annual Faculty Activity Statement, which ensures comparability of these documents across the college. The chair will review this document and will use it as the basis for an annual performance review of each tenured member of the division. The chair will provide each faculty member with written feedback regarding his/her performance and future plans. This review will enable the chair to highlight performance problems where they exist and to assist faculty in carrying out their professional plans. A face-to-face meeting is a required component of the annual review. A tenured faculty member may respond in writing to the chair's performance evaluations. Annual reviews should be constructive and candid. The college is committed to using the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement.

When salary recommendations have been approved by the university, a letter is sent to each faculty member that states his or her new salary for the coming fiscal year. Additional feedback regarding performance is provided as needed to assist the faculty member in remaining productive.

### **C. Clinical Faculty**

The annual review process for clinical faculty in their first term of appointment is parallel to that required for probationary tenure-track faculty, and the review process for clinical faculty in their second and subsequent terms of appointment is parallel to that required for tenured faculty. If the position will continue, a review will occur in the penultimate year of the probationary period and in each subsequent term of

appointment for clinical faculty. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) must be observed.

#### **D. Research Faculty**

The annual review process for research faculty in their first term of appointment is parallel to that required for probationary tenure-track faculty, and the review process for research faculty in their second and subsequent terms of appointment is parallel to that required for tenured faculty. If the position will continue, a review will occur in the penultimate year of the probationary period and in each subsequent term of appointment for research faculty. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) must be observed.

#### **E. Associated Faculty**

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The dean, or his/her designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The dean's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. Associated faculty are reviewed annually or as defined in their contract for reappointment. For reappointment, there should be a substantial involvement by the appointee in the academic work of the college. Division faculty should review annually the associated faculty of the division. The appointment of faculty who cease to contribute substantially to the mission of the college should not be renewed. If the recommendation is to renew, the dean may extend a multiple-year appointment.

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

## **VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASE AND OTHER REWARDS**

### **A. Criteria**

The annual performance evaluation described in Section V will serve as the basis for the recommended annual salary increase. Unless the university directs otherwise, all money made available to the college for annual increments is distributed on the basis of merit in the categories of scholarship, teaching, patient care (if applicable), and service. While quantitative measures are always useful, they will never be the sole criterion by which performance is measured. Performance in any area of research, teaching or service will be evaluated as a whole and will not be dependent

upon any particular criteria. Merit in scholarship may be determined by such quantitative indicators as the number of publications, but must also be qualified by the standing of the journals and professional conferences that serve as outlets for scholarship, by the anonymous evaluations provided by the process of peer review, professional awards, prizes and recognition for work done, and finally the chair's judgment regarding the excellence and impact of the scholarship. Merit in teaching should consider the number and difficulty of courses and independent studies taught, the number and quality of graduate students directed, the number of students from other departments who seek out a particular faculty member, curricular innovation, and student evaluations. Merit in service is reflected in the committees on which a faculty member has served, and by such qualitative indicators as visibility as editor, member of editorial boards, leadership in scientific and professional societies, and excellent service on particularly time-consuming college committees. In making salary recommendations, the previous year's performance will normally be considered. When the money available is extraordinarily large, or after a period of extraordinarily small increments, the period considered may extend to the previous two or three years. Salary increases will never be based upon promises of forthcoming performance.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

## **B. Procedures**

The chair of each division will meet separately with the dean to discuss the annual performance evaluation of each faculty member in their division. The evaluation will be based on the Faculty Activity Statement submitted by each faculty member and an assessment of each faculty member's accomplishments in contributing to the college's mission. This discussion serves as the basis for the dean's annual salary recommendation. All money made available to the college for annual salary increases is distributed on the basis of collegiality and professionalism and merit in the categories of scholarship, teaching, health care (if applicable), and service, unless the university directs otherwise. The dean, in consultation with the chair, will determine the amount of recommended salary increase for each faculty member. Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the division chair should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low.

## **C. Documentation**

All faculty must complete the same Faculty Activity Statement. They are encouraged to include copies of the comments of referees, and any other indicators of the quality and impact that the faculty member's work has had on others.

## VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION

According to 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 endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances, superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.*

### A. Criteria

#### 1. Tenure-Track Faculty

##### a) Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The college has no quantitative measure that either bars or guarantees promotion to tenure. To be eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and for tenure, the candidate must show superior intellectual attainment through a significant body of scholarship in his or her field. He or she must show significant achievements that will have an impact on the development of scholarship in the field and the ability to undertake sustained and continuing original work. Typically this will take the form of a series of peer-reviewed, published papers in a particular area, which are based upon original research that is supported by outside sponsors. In addition, the assistant professor must have demonstrated excellence as a teacher of undergraduate, graduate and/or professional students. An assistant professor is typically not asked to serve on many committees. Nevertheless, he or she should have established a record of good citizenship through a willingness to serve when asked and should provide a conscientious performance. These criteria and the procedures for evaluation of performance are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

##### (1) Teaching

The college of pharmacy has a tradition of commitment to teaching and expects its faculty to contribute to this tradition. Effective teaching is an essential criterion for advancement. The following points, among others, should be considered in evaluating the candidate's effectiveness in teaching: knowledge, understanding, and presentation of the subject matter taught; the necessary foundations, current developments, and major issues of the subject matter taught; appropriateness of the degree of difficulty of the material being presented, taking into consideration the level of and preparation by the students; application of contemporary teaching and learning techniques, appropriateness of course formats for the subject matter being taught; appropriateness of methods of assessing

student learning; an ability to organize material and to present it with logic and conviction; a capacity to create in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject matter to more advanced material, to the study of related subjects, to other disciplines and/or to professional practice; objectivity; the creativity, spirit, and enthusiasm that invigorate the candidate's teaching; an ability to arouse curiosity, stimulate creativity, and enhance learning among students; and the extent and skill of participation in the general guidance and advising of students. The candidate's contribution to the teaching mission of the college may also include the development of courses, curricula, practice sites, evaluation instruments, and innovative teaching materials and methods. Division chairs should provide candidates with a statement of "expectations about teaching" within their divisions. Such a statement should include the: (a) typical teaching and advising loads, including the number of courses per semester, the level of instruction, the nature of the student clientele, and whether the courses are required or elective; and (b) differentiation of expectations by rank and responsibilities.

## **(2) Research**

The capability of being continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance is a basic requisite for maintaining and enhancing professional competence of any faculty member. Usually, the measures of quality and quantity of published refereed research and other creative work are used as indicators of professional competence of faculty members engaged in scholarly work. In general, there should be evidence that the candidate is consistently and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance with an area of emphasis in independent and collaborative research and scholarly work. It is recognized that there is a trend towards "team-based science", in which a faculty member may have a defined technical role or roles in a funded project as part of a collaborative peer group. These activities will be evaluated.

## **(3) Delivery of Health Care (if Applicable)**

Some tenure-track faculty members are engaged in clinical practice and thus the delivery of health care represents a component of their responsibilities. Health care includes direct and indirect involvement with patients, both healthy and ill, in assuming joint responsibility for achievement of optimal drug-related outcomes. Patient care requires the faculty member to base some or all interventions on either consultation with the patient or an evaluation of patient-specific information. The faculty member should demonstrate excellence in professional practice in the delivery of health care. Care to the patient can be provided by students, residents, or fellows under the direct supervision and guidance of the candidate.

#### **(4) Service**

Faculty members are expected by the university and the public to make their professional knowledge and skills available in ways beyond those discussed under teaching and research. Thus, service to the division, college, university, local community, state, nation and international community, as well as to academic and professional organizations, is an important component of the faculty member's obligation.

#### **b) Promotion to Professor**

The college expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Exceptional performance in teaching and scholarship is required. The candidate must have made demonstrably significant scholarly contributions to his or her area of expertise, contributions that have secured him or her a national and/or international reputation. The candidate should have produced a body of scholarship that represents a continuing and strong record of publications since promotion to the associate professor rank. It is further required that there be strong evidence that the candidate's work has moved the field forward. Typically, evidence will include accomplishments like a series of published papers that opened a new area of investigation, national and international grants and fellowships, and invitations to speak at prestigious conferences and universities. There must be evidence of continuous past accomplishment and of a strong ongoing scholarly agenda, which predicts continued eminence in the field. Scholarly contributions as a member of collaborative research projects will be evaluated. In addition, the candidate must have demonstrated continued excellence as a teacher of graduate and/or professional students, and must have an excellent record of service to the college, university, and scholarly community. These criteria and the procedures for their evaluation are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

## **2. Clinical Faculty**

Since faculty in this category may have variability in their source of funding and percent appointment and may have variability in responsibilities to the university, the evaluation process must take these weighted commitments and responsibilities into consideration. Therefore, a description of faculty responsibilities should become a part of the dossier.

#### **a) Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor**

The college has no quantitative measure that either bars or guarantees promotion. To be eligible for promotion from clinical assistant professor to clinical associate professor, the candidate must provide convincing evidence that he or she has achieved, and is expected to continue to provide excellence in teaching and in the delivery of health care. The candidate must

demonstrate scholarship, and must provide effective service. These criteria and the procedures for evaluation of performance are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

### **(1) Teaching**

Teaching, in a wide variety of formats, comprises a significant portion of the clinical faculty member's responsibilities. Consistent with the commitment to teaching, excellence in teaching is an important criterion for advancement. The following points are considered in evaluation of teaching and its effectiveness: knowledge of the subject; maintaining currency of material about the subjects taught; an ability to develop and organize subject material and present it with logic and conviction; application and sharing of current teaching and learning techniques; a capacity to interact effectively with students in order to motivate, stimulate, and inspire them to learn and inquire, as well as to improve as a future professional; and an ability to maintain high standards of performance for both students and oneself.

### **(2) Delivery of Health Care**

The development of the clinical candidate's practice and subsequent delivery of health care is a vital and substantial component of the candidate's responsibilities. Health care includes direct and indirect involvement with patients, both healthy and ill, in assuming joint responsibility for achieving optimal drug-related outcomes. Indirect patient care is generally defined but not limited to contributing to sustainable innovative cutting-edge practices or other activities that contribute to the advancement of the profession of pharmacy, facilitate the delivery of broad-reaching educational training programs, provide advanced experiential training sites, support the college's teaching, outreach and engagement mission, and/or engage in practice-based or educational research.

Patient care requires the pharmacist to base some or all interventions on either consultation with the patient or an evaluation of patient-specific information. All clinical faculty members must be involved with the delivery of patient care. (It should be noted the term "patient care" includes activities associated with managed care). The clinical faculty member must demonstrate excellence in professional practice in the delivery of patient care. Care to the patient can be provided by students or residents under the direct supervision and guidance of the candidate. Candidates must demonstrate appropriate understanding of the disease state and patient assessment methods, must identify and manage the medication use process, and must be able to provide and document evidence-based, individualized pharmacotherapeutic interventions. Furthermore, the ability

to communicate clearly and effectively with patients and prescribers must be demonstrated.

### **(3) Scholarly and Creative Work**

Although scholarly activity comprises a smaller proportion of responsibilities than teaching and practice, clinical faculty must contribute to the existing body of knowledge that advances the discipline by engaging in scholarly activity related to their teaching and/or practice activity.

### **(4) Service**

This area reflects the candidate's service to the division, college, university, the profession and the public. Consideration should be given to faculty at practice sites with patient care responsibilities, and the effect of these responsibilities on their availability for campus-based service.

### **b) Promotion to Clinical Professor**

The college of pharmacy expects an individual ready for promotion to clinical professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. The candidate must have made scholarly contributions to his or her area of expertise. Promotion to clinical professor must be based on convincing evidence that the candidate has: a sustained record of excellence in teaching and in the provision of health care delivery, has produced a body of scholarship that is recognized by peers, and demonstrates leadership in service. In addition, the candidate should have achieved national recognition in at least one area – teaching, research or service (including clinical practice). These criteria and the procedures for their evaluation are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

## **3. Research Faculty**

### **a) Promotion to Research Associate Professor**

Promotion to the research faculty rank of associate professor is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a researcher, demonstrated both by the quality of the work and the ability to attract external support. Evidence must also indicate that the faculty member can be expected to continue a program of high-quality scholarship supported by external funding, relevant to the mission of the college.

### **b) Promotion to Research Professor**

Promotion to the research faculty rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in research and scholarship that is recognized nationally and/or internationally, including a continual record of success in obtaining external research funding from peer-reviewed sources. Persons holding this rank

should be clearly recognized as leaders in their field, whose presence substantially enhances the research program of the college, including the mentoring of others.

### **3. Associated Faculty**

Since faculty in this category may have variability in their source of funding and percent appointment and may have variability in responsibilities to the university, the evaluation process must take these weighted commitments and responsibilities into consideration. Therefore, a description of faculty responsibilities should become a part of the dossier.

#### **a) Promotion to Associate Professor - Practice**

The college has no quantitative measure that either bars or guarantees promotion. To be eligible for promotion from assistant professor practice to associate professor practice, the candidate must provide convincing evidence that he or she has achieved, and is expected to continue to provide excellence in teaching, and/or in the delivery of health care, and/or effective service. Scholarship may or may not be an expectation of an associated faculty member. These criteria and the procedures for evaluation of performance are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

##### **(1) Teaching**

Teaching, in a wide variety of formats, comprises a significant portion of the associated faculty member's responsibilities. Consistent with the commitment to teaching, excellence in teaching is an important criterion for advancement. The following points are considered in evaluation of teaching and its effectiveness: knowledge of subject; maintaining currency of material about subjects taught; ability to develop and organize subject material and present it with logic and conviction; application and sharing of current teaching and learning techniques; capacity to interact effectively with students in order to motivate, stimulate, and inspire them to learn and inquire, as well as to improve as a future professional; and ability to maintain high standards of performance for both students and oneself.

##### **(2) Delivery of Health Care**

The development of the candidate's practice and subsequent delivery of health care may be a vital and substantial component of the candidate's responsibilities. Health care includes direct and indirect involvement with patients, both healthy and ill, in assuming joint responsibility for achieving optimal drug-related outcomes. Indirect patient care is generally defined but not limited to contributing to sustainable innovative cutting-edge practices or other activities that contribute to the advancement of the profession of pharmacy, facilitate the delivery of broad-reaching educational training programs, provide advanced experiential training

sites, support the college's teaching, outreach and engagement mission, and/or engage in practice-based or educational research.

Patient care requires the pharmacist to base some or all interventions on either consultation with the patient or an evaluation of patient-specific information. If applicable, the associated faculty member must demonstrate excellence in professional practice in the delivery of patient care. Care to the patient can be provided by students or residents under the direct supervision and guidance of the candidate. Candidates must demonstrate appropriate understanding of the disease state and patient assessment methods, must identify and manage the medication use process, and must be able to provide and document evidence-based, individualized pharmacotherapeutic interventions. Furthermore, the ability to communicate clearly and effectively with patients and prescribers must be demonstrated.

### **(3) Service**

This area reflects the candidate's service to the division, college, university, the profession and the public. Consideration should be given to faculty at practice sites with patient care responsibilities, and the effect of these responsibilities on their availability for campus-based service.

### **(4) Scholarly and Creative Work**

If applicable, scholarly activity will comprise a smaller proportion of responsibilities than teaching and practice. Associated faculty should contribute to the existing body of knowledge that advances the discipline by engaging in scholarly activity related to their teaching, practice, or service activity.

## **b) Promotion to Professor - Practice**

The college of pharmacy expects an individual ready for promotion to professor - practice to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Promotion to professor - practice must be based on convincing evidence that the candidate has a sustained record of excellence in teaching and/or in the provision of health care delivery, and/or leadership in service and, if applicable, has produced a body of scholarship that is recognized by peers. In addition, the candidate should have achieved national recognition in at least one area – teaching, practice or service (including clinical practice). These criteria and the procedures for their evaluation are further elaborated on in other paragraphs of this section.

The review procedure for associated faculty should be thorough, but is generally less intensive than the procedures used for tenure-track faculty and clinical faculty. The evaluation of professional competence of the associated faculty member requires broader interpretation of “research and

creative work” than that used in the traditional sense in the evaluation of tenure-track and clinical faculty members. While some associated faculty members are involved in research that results in refereed publications, they are generally not required to do so. Other avenues for publication include educational and professional journals for communication of original techniques, experiences, approaches and solutions to problems encountered in practice.

For associated clinical faculty, examples of productivity include the size and growth rate of the practice, any innovative teaching techniques that are introduced, the number and type of innovative programs developed and implemented in practice, and the numbers of publications and professional presentations. Indicators of quality include frequency and type of consultation sought by physicians and other health care practitioners, invited presentations at professional meetings, supportive evaluation letters from highly regarded practitioners and professional association leaders, and evidence of ability and success in making an impact on pharmacy practice. Outside evaluators for associated clinical promotions may be sought from peers involved in provision of patient care who may not hold academic titles.

## **B. Procedures**

The college of pharmacy’s procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) and the annually updated Office Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, as found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty members in the college.

### **1. Candidate Responsibilities**

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier that is 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 are responsible for submitting a copy of the APT document of the College of Pharmacy that was in effect at the time of the candidate’s hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he wishes to be reviewed under the document’s criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the division.

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the division chair in consultation with senior divisional faculty and the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than

two names, providing the reasons for so doing are given. The division chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see "External Evaluations" below.)

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

The responsibilities of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee are as follows:

- a)** To review the College APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
  
- b)** To consider annually, in the 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The APT committee must confirm with the college dean that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (i.e., 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 the college of pharmacy.

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

- c)** Annually, in late spring through the late autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

**d) Early Autumn.** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) 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.

**e) Late Spring – Early Summer.** Suggest names of external evaluators to the division chair, if requested to do so.

**f) Mid-Autumn.** Review dossiers of candidates 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.

**g)** Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting would not be an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

**h)** Draft an analysis in the form of PowerPoint slides of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty prior to the vote at the ballot meeting; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The APT committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.

**i)** Provide a completed written evaluation and a recommendation to the dean of the college of pharmacy of each case, following the faculty ballot meeting, including the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting.

**j)** Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

**k)** Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair or college dean in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit (TIU) is in another college. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the APT Committee recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than when the committee begins meeting on cases for the college of pharmacy.

### **3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities**

The major responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are two-fold. First, they should review thoroughly and objectively the dossier of each candidate in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

Second, they should attend all eligible faculty ballot meetings to participate in the discussion of every case and to vote, except when extenuating circumstances prevent attendance.

#### **4. Division Chair Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the division chair are as follows:

- a) Summer Term.** To solicit names for potential external reviewers for the candidate from senior members of the division.
- b)** To compile a list of potential external reviewers, nominated by the candidate, the division, and, if necessary the APT Committee, and to disclose this list to the candidate to check for possible conflicts of interest. The division chair should solicit external evaluations of the candidate from this list. (Also see “External Evaluations” below.)
- c) Mid-Autumn Semester.** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, prior to the ballot meeting of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation.

#### **5. Responsibilities of the College Dean**

The responsibilities of the dean are as follows:

- a)** Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by the college of pharmacy.
- b)** To deposit an electronic copy of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the ballot meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted on.
- c)** 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.
- d)** To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to any questions raised during the meeting.
- e) Late-Autumn Semester.** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

**f)** To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

**g)** To contact each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process. The information provided in this letter should include: the recommendations by the division chair and the eligible faculty; the availability for review of the written evaluations by the division chair, eligible faculty, and dean, and of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the dean, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

**h)** To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.

**i)** To receive the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units (TIUs), and to forward this material, along with the division chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

## **6. 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 compensated associated faculty promotion reviews. For clinical faculty, external evaluations should assess productivity in teaching, service (practice), and scholarship, based on established criteria for promotion.

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

**a)** Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an "arm's length" evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The college of pharmacy will only solicit evaluations from full professors at institutions comparable in stature to The Ohio State University. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

**b)** Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. The usefulness of a given letter may be defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the college of pharmacy cannot control who will agree to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the middle of the summer term prior to the review year. This scheduling 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 division chair (with input from senior faculty members) and the candidate, and, as necessary, by the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the college of pharmacy requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The college of pharmacy 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 division chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (such as requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the self-interest of the candidate 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 written evaluations of the college of pharmacy, or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for input.

### **C. Documentation**

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the college Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check a given dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the college of pharmacy. The type of documentation of research and scholarship and service noted below is for use during the college review only, unless reviewers at the university levels specifically request it. Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication. Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

### **1. Teaching**

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to the present. Examples of documentation include: cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar for every class; peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the division or college for peer evaluation of the teaching program (details are provided in Section X below); and copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. Also, teaching activities as listed in the core dossier may include: involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research; mentoring of postdoctoral scholars and researchers; extension and continuing education instruction; involvement in curriculum development; awards and formal recognition of teaching; presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences, and adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities.

### **2. Research and Scholarship**

Although quantity is easier to measure than quality, evaluators must exercise extreme care in evaluating co-authored research. To facilitate the evaluation process, the candidate is expected to indicate the nature of contributions made to co-authored research, and to separate refereed publications from other publications. Additionally, when a candidate has been involved in dissemination of essentially the same information several times (e.g., as a proceedings piece,

an abstract, a journal article, and/or a book chapter), the candidate is expected to indicate clearly the relationships among various writings to aid in the evaluation.

The examples of evidence of quantity or productivity of a faculty candidate include not only the number of refereed research and review papers, books, and monographs published, but also the candidate's description of unusual breadth, depth, length and/or significance; the number and significance of patents held; the number and amount of contracts and grants and their relevance to the research program; and the momentum or rate of progress of the research program. Although work-in-progress may be examined, especially in the case of the fourth-year review, completed and published or in press works represent the primary evidence of the candidate's research contributions. While textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications are normally considered evidence of teaching ability or public service, they are considered as creative work only when they present new ideas or new understanding, provide critical analysis, or incorporate scholarly research.

Evidence of quality is exemplified further by positive evaluation of the candidate's research by widely known and respected outside scientists and scholars in the candidate's field; evidence of the candidate's efforts, ability, and success in attracting financial support for his/her research; the continuity of the candidate's research efforts and results; the quality and reputation of the journals in which research is published; the candidate's standing among peers in his/her field; invitations to present research seminars; participation in symposia related to the candidate's research; participation in scientific meetings; participation as a reviewer of research papers and proposals of others; and the positive appraisal of his/her publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature.

### **3. Service and Professional Practice**

There are many types of service contributions. University service by members of the faculty includes, but is not limited to, the following activities:

- a)** Serving as the division chair or in any other administrative capacity at the division, college, or university levels;
- b)** Serving as a leader or member of task forces or committees providing service to the division, the college or the university;
- c)** Contributing to student welfare as an advisor to student organizations and to students.
- d)** Service outside the university can include:
  - (1)** Serving as an appointed or elected officer of an academic or professional association;

(2) Serving as an organizer of symposia, workshops, panels, or meetings in areas of professional competence;

(3) Refereeing manuscripts submitted to journals, professional meeting program committees, membership on the editorial board of a journal, or serving as an editor;

(4) Serving as a speaker or presenter at non-academic meetings in areas of professional competence;

(5) Serving as a leader or member of a task force or committee providing service to local, state, regional, national, or international organizations;

(6) Serving as an unpaid and/or paid professional consultant to public or private organizations;

(7) Delivering health care.

#### **4. Health Care (if Applicable)**

Various approaches for documentation of the impact made by the candidate on patient care can be used. The documentation should include a clear description of the type of pharmacy practice offered. The role of the candidate should be discussed, including the individual roles of residents and fellows. The candidate may document his or her impact on patient care outcomes and whether elements of his or her program have been transferred to other clinical sites or institutions. Further indicators of success may include the impact on standards of practice, contributions to the body of knowledge in the candidate's area of practice, and honors, awards, or recognition by various professional societies at the local, state, national, and international levels. Additional documentation can include the frequency and type of consultations sought, letters from physicians, administrators, other clinical practitioners, and co-workers; and honors and awards that reflect excellence in clinical practice.

#### **5. Associated Faculty**

The candidate, in consultation with the division chair, should prepare a dossier, according to the guidelines provided by the Office of Academic Affairs, which captures the teaching, pharmaceutical practice, scholarly activity, and service activities of the candidate. It is recommended that an updated curriculum vitae is also submitted to the division chair. Elements of the dossier that are required for tenure-track and clinical faculty should be included, as appropriate. Also needed are: a description of the practice site and practice site development associated with the candidate (not required for non-clinical faculty); the courses taught, including the development of new courses, and the role of the candidate in these courses; the number of students precepted (since the last promotion); continuing education courses taught (since the last promotion); any teaching honors

received; student evaluations of the candidate's teaching and precepting (since the last promotion); the demonstrated quality and high standards of practice at the practice site, as indicated by any honors, awards or recognition by professional societies; documented scholarly activity, including any publications or professional presentations, and service to the college, university, profession and community should be documented.

Letters of evaluation should be obtained by the division chair, as appropriate, from evaluators suggested by the candidate and by the senior faculty of the division. Candidates seeking instructor and assistant professor ranks will normally need an evaluation letter from their supervisor at the practice site addressing their quality of practice. Letters from other health care providers at the site are welcome, but not required, at the instructor rank. For candidates seeking the associate professor – practice or the professor – practice rank, evaluation letters from their supervisor at the practice site, and a colleague directly involved with the candidate, such as physicians or pharmacists, are required. Three letters from appropriate individuals are required. These evaluators would be suggested by the candidate and division chair, as appropriate. The candidate's dossier will be sent to these individuals for evaluation.

The eligible division faculty, at or above the rank being applied for, will review the dossier and, at a meeting called by the division chair specifically for this purpose, the application will be discussed by eligible faculty. The division chair shall write a letter of evaluation of the candidate that recommends approval or disapproval of the application. If the recommendation is to approve the application, the letter and supporting documents will be submitted to the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee for presentation at a "ballot meeting" of the eligible faculty of the college. The application will subsequently be handled, as described for tenure-track and clinical faculty

## **VIII. APPEALS**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth general criteria for appeals for negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).

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

## **IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

## **X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

Evaluation of teaching should be carried out by peer faculty and by students enrolled in courses taught by the faculty member. Peer evaluation of teaching is necessary to achieve a reliable, valid, and integrated understanding of the faculty member's overall performance. Information from students may be useful in judging the coherence and clarity of presentations, acquisition of knowledge and skills, and stimulation of interest. The method of evaluation of teaching may vary according to the type of instructional setting:

- a) Classroom teaching in degree programs;
- b) One-on-one teaching, including mentoring of graduate students and undergraduate students in research;
- c) Small-group teaching;
- d) Teaching in continuing education programs and non-traditional programs;
- e) Teaching at the practice site.

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

#### **1. Student Evaluation**

Students should be given the opportunity to evaluate every course every time that it is taught (Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, Section IV). The university electronic Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument must be used for evaluation of all courses excepting seminar, independent studies, and professional experience program rotations. Faculty may supplement this information using additional evaluation instruments or methods of their choice. The course coordinator or division chair should supervise the distribution of the evaluation instrument to students and its collection and analysis. A separate instrument should be used for each faculty member who participates significantly in the course. Efforts should be made to maximize the number of students who participate in the evaluation. When there is a large discrepancy between the number of students enrolled and the number who participate in the evaluation, the evaluation cannot be assumed to accurately represent student opinion.

#### **2. Other Teaching**

**a) One-On-One and Small-Group Teaching.** The college of pharmacy recognizes that the mentoring of graduate students is an important teaching activity. The faculty member candidate should prepare a statement of his or her mentoring activities. Other evidence of one-on-one and small-group teaching may include: the results of externship and clerkship evaluation forms (required for participating clinical faculty); evaluation by Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI; required except when the number of students is too small); letters from students and alumni; letters from peers (e.g., letters from auxiliary or faculty of equal or higher rank, physicians, or other co-workers); evidence of student interest in working with the faculty member on special projects, examinations, theses, and dissertations; and other indications of quality of projects supervised, such as publications in peer-reviewed journals. These materials should be part of the information the faculty member provides to their division chair at their annual review.

**b) Development of Courses, Curricula, Evaluation Instruments, and Innovative Teaching Materials.** Included in this category may be: new course proposals and syllabi; evidence of effectiveness including enrollment information and acceptance of the course curriculum by other academic units within and outside the university; examples of innovative teaching materials; evidence of acceptance of materials beyond own classes the candidate (e.g., inclusion of materials in books, requests for use by other faculty members, requests for material by practitioners and professional associations); and letters from students and alumni.

**c) Presentations Related to Teaching.** The following activities should be documented by the faculty member and provided to their division chair as part of the annual review process: participation as a speaker or a panelist at state and national educational conferences; participation in workshops, seminars, and conferences intended to improve teaching skills; leadership or active committee service in educational associations; and distribution of novel teaching and evaluation procedures, teaching materials, and other innovations to colleagues.

**d) Continuing Education.** The following activities should be documented by the faculty member candidate and provided to their division chair as part of their annual review process: materials documenting program evaluation by participants; letters from course coordinators; letters of evaluation from participants; and evidence that the continuing education program material provided is used by participants in their own practice sites.

**e) Distance Learning.** The following activities should be documented by the faculty member and provided to their division chair as part of their annual review process: evaluation of the course content and organization; the instrument(s) used for evaluation of student learning; and the effectiveness of

the distance learning materials to convey the course content should be evaluated. Formal course evaluations by participants should be included.

**f) Practice Site.** The college of pharmacy recognizes that teaching at a practice site may represent a substantial component for some clinical faculty. The candidate should gather and evaluate evidence related to the practice-based teaching site. The faculty member should prepare a complete written description of his or her provision of health care and that of the student(s), residents, or fellows under the direct supervision of the faculty member. Documentation of teaching effectiveness must include results of formal student evaluations of teaching. Additional evidence may include letters of critical evaluation from peers (including physicians) based on direct observation of the faculty member at the practice site. Letters should evaluate appropriateness of teaching style, quality and clarity of written materials, and knowledge of the material.

The following additional items may be used to evaluate the teaching function: alumni evaluations of the long-term impact of the faculty member's teaching and advising; handouts and ancillary instructional material; demonstrations, laboratory preparations, instructional computer use, noteworthy pictorial aids; training and supervision of teaching assistants; attempts to improve teaching methods and develop innovative teaching techniques; assessment procedures, such as written examinations, assignments, and evaluations intended to facilitate the critical thinking, problem-solving skills, and curiosity of students; textbooks and other teaching materials produced by the faculty member; guest lectures or other teaching; uncompensated community and professional service teaching; evidence of student achievement as a result of the faculty member's teaching efforts. In addition to the above-mentioned items, and of particular significance in the appointment at or promotion to the rank of professor, other evidence of teaching quality are:

- a) The opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the university;
- b) The number as well as caliber of students guided in research by the faculty member and of those attracted to the campus by the faculty member.

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

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

### **1. Peer Evaluation**

Peer evaluation should be comprehensive and should include those aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate. The frequency of peer review may vary according to rank and the evidence of need.

The peer review process will be managed by the associate dean for academic affairs in collaboration with the faculty being reviewed and their respective division chair. At the beginning of each academic year, the associate dean for academic affairs and the relevant division chair will identify the faculty to be reviewed. Each faculty member to be reviewed will undergo review by an appropriate reviewer. The reviewer will assemble the salient data and information to be considered.

Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model should be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the evaluators of teaching are as follows:

To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty at least 4 times before the commencement of the mandatory tenure or re-appointment review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

**a)** To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate professors of clinical pharmacy at least once every third year or two times before commencement of a promotion review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

**b)** To review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professors of clinical pharmacy at least periodically (may be written or verbal) with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

**c)** To review, upon the request of the division chair, 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.

**d)** 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 as formative only. The division chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking

formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching ([www.ucat.osu.edu](http://www.ucat.osu.edu)).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the division chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer(s) should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer(s) 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 or reviewers will meet with the candidate to give feedback and also submit a written report to the division 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.

## **XI. REVISION**

All alterations, deletions and additions in the standards and procedures outlined in this document shall be discussed and approved by the college faculty.

## XII. SAMPLE DOCUMENTS

Form letter for request of evaluation from outside evaluator of faculty:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The College of Pharmacy is considering Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ for promotion to the rank of (associate) professor (with tenure). Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s performance in teaching, research and service will be evaluated at the division, college and university levels to determine whether promotion (and tenure) will be granted. On behalf of the college faculty, I am asking you only to provide a critical assessment of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s research and other scholarly work. However, if you have information about Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s teaching or service that would be helpful in the review process, please feel free to provide that information.

Enclosed you will find a copy of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s curriculum vitae and copies of the following papers:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

In a letter to me, please comment in some detail on the significance of the overall research program as well as on individual papers, including the scientific merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study. In addition, please compare Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ to other researchers in this field at the same stage of career development. Please note that you are not being asked whether Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ should be promoted and tenured at Ohio State or would or would not be promoted and tenured at your institution.

Under the Ohio Open Records Act all documents related to P&T reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. Thus we cannot promise confidentiality.

The university requires documentation of your credentials as a reviewer. It would therefore be helpful if you supplied us with a short biographical sketch; e.g., the NIH Grant Application Biosketch or similar <http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html> three- to four-page biographical sketch that we could forward along with your critical assessment. We would appreciate receiving your report by \_\_\_\_\_, at the latest.

Thank you very much for your time and effort in responding to this request.

Sincerely,

---

Professor and Chair

Form letter for request of evaluation from outside evaluator of clinical faculty:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The College of Pharmacy is considering Dr. \_\_\_ for promotion to the rank of \_\_\_ professor of clinical pharmacy practice and administration. Dr. \_\_\_'s performance in teaching, health care delivery, scholarship, and service will be evaluated at the division, college, and university levels to determine whether promotion will be granted. On behalf of the college faculty, I am asking you to provide a critical assessment of Dr. \_\_\_ in the areas of teaching, health care delivery, and scholarship.

Dr. \_\_\_ is a member of the clinical faculty of the College of Pharmacy. Faculty in this category are not eligible for tenure but have contracts up for renewal every five years. They engage in activities which consist primarily of patient care and clinical teaching. Although scholarly activity comprise a smaller proportion of responsibilities than teaching and practice, clinical faculty must contribute to the existing body of knowledge that advances the discipline by engaging in scholarly activity related to their teaching and practice activity.

To assist you in making your critical assessment, we are providing you with excerpts of Dr. \_\_\_'s dossier documenting the evidence surrounding their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, patient care, and scholarship. In addition, you will find a copy of Dr. \_\_\_'s curriculum vitae.

In a letter to me, please comment in some detail on the significance of their overall accomplishments, degree of excellence in their documented delivery of health care, quality and innovation of teaching, and significance of their scholarship to the growth of pharmacy practice and/or education. In addition, please compare Dr. \_\_\_ to other clinical faculty in the field at the same stage of career development. Please note that you are not being asked whether Dr. \_\_\_ should be promoted at Ohio State or would be promoted at your institution.

Under the Ohio Open Records Act all documents related to P&T reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. Thus we cannot promise confidentiality.

The university requires documentation of your credentials as a reviewer. It would therefore be helpful if you supplied us with a short biographical sketch; e.g., the NIH Grant Application Biosketch or similar three- to four-page biographical sketch that we could forward along with your critical assessment. We would appreciate receiving your report by \_\_\_\_\_, at the latest.

Thank you very much for your time and effort in responding to this request.

Sincerely,

---

Professor and Chair

BALLOT

CANDIDATE: \_\_\_\_\_

Vote to approve or disapprove the candidate's application for (circle one):

fourth-year review   promotion   promotion and tenure

\_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE

\_\_\_\_\_ DISAPPROVE

\_\_\_\_\_ ABSTAIN

**FACULTY REVIEW**  
**The OSU College of Pharmacy**  
**(Year \_\_\_\_)**

**CANDIDATE:**

**DATE:**

**OPTIONAL EVALUATION SCALE:**

Outstanding  
Excellent  
Good

Satisfactory  
Needs Improvement and/or More Effort  
Unsatisfactory

**EVALUATION:**

TEACHING

RESEARCH

SERVICE

Narrative evaluation of teaching, research and service are on the next page.

**SIGNATURES:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**FACULTY COMMENTS:**

(Attach additional pages if necessary)

I. TEACHING

EVALUATION:

II. RESEARCH

EVALUATION:

III. SERVICE

EVALUATION: