

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

Department of Veterinary Biosciences

OAA Approved 5/13/2019

Table of Contents

I. Preamble.....3

II. Department Mission.....3

III. Definitions.....4

 A. Types of Faculty Appointments 4

 B. Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF)..... 4

 C. Membership of the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) 5

 C1. Tenure-track Faculty 5

 C2. Clinical Faculty 5

 C3. Research Faculty 5

 D. Quorum for Meetings of the CEF 5

 E. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty..... 6

 E1. Appointment..... 6

 E2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Contract Renewal 6

 F. Conflict of Interest for the Chair or Members of the CEF..... 6

 G. Minimal Composition of the CEF..... 6

 H. Personnel Records 6

IV. Appointments..... 7

 A. Criteria..... 7

 A1. Tenure Track Faculty..... 7

 A2. Clinical Faculty 8

 A3. Research Faculty 8

 A4. Transfer of Track 9

 A5. Appointment of Emeritus Faculty 9

 A6. Associated Faculty 9

 A7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 10

 B. Procedures for Appointment..... 10

 B1. Tenure Track Faculty..... 11

 B2. Clinical Faculty 12

 B3. Research Faculty 12

 B4. Associated Faculty..... 13

 B5. Courtesy Appointment for Faculty 13

C. Withdrawal of Appointments.....	13
V. Annual Review of Faculty Performance.....	13
A. Introduction.....	13
B. Procedures for Annual Review	14
C. Documentation for Annual Reviews of Tenure-Track, Clinical and Research Faculty.	16
VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	17
A. Criteria	17
B. Procedures	18
C. Documentation.....	18
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	18
A. Introduction.....	18
B. Criteria for Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty.....	19
C. Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Faculty.....	22
D. Criteria for the Promotion of Research Faculty	23
E. Review Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure	24
VIII. Appeals	29
IX. Seventh Year Reviews	29
X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	29
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	29
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	29
Appendix	31

I. Preamble

The Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document of the Department of Veterinary Biosciences defines faculty categories and ranks, as well as describes procedures and criteria for searches, appointments, annual reviews, merit salary increases and other rewards, promotion, and tenure. It also sets forth the department's mission in the context of the missions of the college and university. This APT document provides the guidelines to be used when executing these departmental processes.

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) before it may be implemented. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission, criteria, and procedures of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating by the described procedures and criteria current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission.

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

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, annual review, promotion, and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the [university's policy on equal opportunity](#).

II. Department Mission

- a. **Purpose:** We discover the mechanisms of disease. We use this knowledge to educate others and to develop and utilize tools for disease diagnosis, treatment, and intervention to improve the health of animals and humans.
- b. **Beneficiaries:** The beneficiaries of our work are
 - those we train (professional and graduate students, advanced trainees such as residents, post-doctoral researchers, and fellows),
 - those for whom we provide diagnostic service (patients and their owners, clinicians, researchers), and
 - those whose health and well-being we improve through advances in veterinary and human medicine.
- c. **Deliverables:**
 - Education:
 - We help to provide the foundation of the pre-clinical and pathology curriculum to veterinary professional students.
 - We help to develop the next generation of scientists and clinician scientists by educating and graduating PhD students.

- We advance the future of veterinary pathology by training and mentoring board-certified veterinary pathologists.

Research:

- We share our discoveries and advance the understanding of the mechanisms of disease by publishing our research findings as primary-authored research publications.
- We create a sustainable high-quality training environment for research through grant support from external funding sources, which provide indirect costs recovery (NIH/USDA/NSF etc.).
We commercialize our research so that it can be used for the diagnosis and treatment of disease.

Clinical services:

- We improve animal health and serve clients, clinicians, and researchers by providing timely and accurate laboratory diagnoses and results.
- We evaluate new diagnostic tools and treatments through the performance of clinical trials to improve clinical outcomes for both veterinary and ultimately human patients.
- We publish clinical findings to better identify and understand naturally occurring mechanisms of disease.
- We provide high quality case-based learning resources for students and trainees.

III. Definitions

A. Types of Faculty Appointments

The Department of Veterinary Biosciences can appoint tenure-track, clinical, research and associated faculty. Appointment as a tenure-track, clinical or research faculty member indicates the faculty holds their primary appointment in the Department of Veterinary Biosciences where the evaluations for appointment, promotion, tenure, reappointment and annual review will be performed as described in this document. All faculty except those on associated appointments may hold FTEs between 50 and 100%. Faculty with appointments in these categories can hold the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. The instructor rank is available within clinical faculty categories and certain associated faculty categories.

Associated faculty can be appointed in the following categories: adjunct faculty, clinical practice faculty, lecturer, faculty with tenure-track titles and FTEs below 50%, and visiting faculty. Adjunct faculty can hold the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Clinical practice faculty can hold the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

The department can provide courtesy appointments to non-associated faculty who hold their primary appointment in another department, school, or college of The Ohio State University. Courtesy appointments may also be made to faculty from other Universities when those individuals offer expertise that can advance our departmental mission.

Full-time tenure-track, clinical, research, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

B. Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF)

The Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) provides feedback on appointments (when indicated), fourth year review of probationary faculty, promotion for tenure, research and clinical faculty, and tenure for tenure track faculty. CEF reviews will evaluate the faculty's teaching, scholarship, and service according to the criteria found in this document. The CEF will summarize its findings in a letter recommending action to the chair that will include the results of a secret ballot that either supports or does not support that action.

CEF membership will include all tenure-track, clinical and research faculty. Attendance at the meetings will be

restricted to those faculty holding higher rank than the candidate being considered and be subject to limitations based on faculty rules [3335-7-04](#) and [3335-7-37](#), which specify governance rights for clinical and research faculty.

A CEF chair will be elected at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting in the spring. The CEF chair should be a tenured professor. The term for the CEF chair will be three years.

For CEF work within an academic year, the members of the CEF containing the largest number of faculty will elect a procedural oversight designee (POD). The POD and the faculty will review the faculty's dossier to insure completeness, accuracy, and clarity. The POD will confirm the faculty's publications listed in the dossier prior to the review by the CEF. The POD will insure the fairness of the CEF's review and will be a member of the administrative services subcommittee that prepares the letter of recommendation to the chair.

An administrative services sub-committee will be formed for each review consisting of the chair of the CEF, the POD and an additional faculty member of the CEF. This sub-committee will prepare the letter to the chair that summarizes the discussion of the CEF and recommended action.

C. Membership of the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF)

C1. Tenure-track Faculty

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

For tenure reviews of probationary professors (i.e., individuals appointed at senior rank without tenure), eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

C2. Clinical Faculty

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

C3. Research Faculty

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

D. Quorum for Meetings of the CEF

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is a two-third majority of the faculty eligible to vote and not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

E. 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 a simple majority of the votes cast is positive.

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

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

F. Conflict of Interest for the Chairperson or Members of the CEF

A conflict of interest exists when the chairperson or a faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, individuals who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from an appointment or promotion review of that candidate. The presence of a conflict of interest is a cause for withdrawal from CEF deliberations. If there is controversy as to the presence of a conflict of interest for a faculty member's participation in the CEF the committee chairperson will determine if a conflict exists.

The department chair and college or university administrators with academic appointments in the department may not participate in CEF functions. The CEF may request the presence of the department chair to provide information. When the CEF is discussing a candidate, that candidate's dissertation chair may not participate in those discussions.

G. Minimal Composition of the CEF

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

H. Personnel Records

Documents relating to appointment, reappointment, promotion or tenure, including letters of offer, appointment, reappointment, annual evaluations, promotion, and when appropriate tenure, will be retained in the personnel records of faculty. These materials are kept by the college human resources and available to the faculty member who may append letters to documents in this file.

IV. Appointments

Faculty appointments are made after determination of the category and rank of the proposed position and identification of the faculty candidate. The candidate must fulfill the criteria for the category which generally will be determined at the initiation of the search. In addition, the rank of the candidate must be determined based on the criteria presented below. If the candidate is determined to be appointed above the rank of assistant professor then the CEF will meet to determine if the record of the candidate meets the criteria for both category and rank. This process must be completed before a formal offer can be made. Please consult Faculty Appointments from the OAA for further details about various appointment types. (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>).

A. Criteria

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

A1. Tenure-track faculty

1a. Assistant Professor

An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory review for promotion and tenure occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory sixth year review year is possible when the CEF determine such a review to be appropriate (see section VII.A3). 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.

1b. Associate Professor or Professor

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Please see the criteria for promotion of assistant to associate professor (see section VII.B). Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

A2. Clinical Faculty

Appointment of clinical faculty entails a three- or five-year contract. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. The possibility of reappointment will be discussed in the faculty's annual review preceding the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information, see [Faculty Rule 3335-7](#).

2a. Instructor of Clinical Veterinary Biosciences

Appointment is normally made at the rank of instructor of clinical veterinary biosciences when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree or has not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a four-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

2b. Assistant Professor of Clinical Veterinary Biosciences

An earned doctorate and the required licensure/certification in his or her specialty are the minimum requirements for appointment as an assistant professor of clinical veterinary biosciences. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

2c. Associate Professor and Professor of Clinical Veterinary Biosciences

Appointment as associate professor of clinical veterinary biosciences or professor of clinical veterinary biosciences requires that the individual have an earned doctorate and the required licensure/certification in his/her specialty, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship as appropriate for promotion to these ranks (see section VII.C).

A3. Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-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. The possibility of reappointment will be discussed in the faculty's annual review preceding the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see [Faculty Rule 3335-7](#).

3a. Research Assistant Professor

Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to establish and sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

3b. 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 department's criteria for scholarship for promotion to these ranks (For more information see **V. Annual Reviews of Faculty Performance**).

A4. Transfer of Track

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

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 clinical or research appointments 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.

A5. Appointment of Emeritus Faculty

Upon retirement, tenure-track, clinical and research faculty may be appointed as emeritus faculty according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-19 \(E\)](#). Retiring faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered. After consultation with the FAC, the chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. See <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf> for further information. Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

A6. Associated Faculty

Associated appointments may be made for up to a three years. Associated appointments are made by the department chair with the advice of the Faculty Advisory Committee and are initiated by a letter of offer stating all terms of the appointment. The letter of offer will be used during the review process to evaluate the faculty's accomplishments in relation to the agreed upon criteria of the appointment (see section V.C5). Associated faculty may be reappointed.

6a. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor

Adjunct appointments are uncompensated. After consultation with and recommendation by the FAC, adjunct faculty appointments may be given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

6b. Clinical Instructor of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor of Practice, Clinical Associate Professor of Practice, or Clinical Professor of Practice

Associated clinical appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. 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.

6c. Lecturer

Lecturer appointments are compensated. 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.

6d. Senior Lecturer

Senior lecturer appointments are compensated. 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.

6e. Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%

Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals appointed at less than a 50% FTE (compensated or uncompensated). 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.

6f. Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

Visiting faculty appointments may be either compensated or uncompensated. After consultation with and recommendation by the FAC, visiting faculty members on leave from academic appointments at another institution with similar missions may be appointed at the rank held at their home institution. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty (see section on tenure-track faculty appointments). Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three years at 100% FTE.

A7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure, clinical, or research faculty member from another department at The Ohio State University warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. The department chair will seek consultation and recommendation from the FAC.

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 university rank, with promotion in rank recognized. The department chair will prepare a letter of appointment that states the terms of the appointment. The letter of appointment will be used as the criteria for reappointment (see section B.5).

B. Procedures for Appointment

The goals of successful faculty searches are to enhance the collective expertise of the departmental faculty and to increase the faculty's abilities to address the mission of the department within the context of the college and university missions. Faculty searches are generally national or international in scope, with an open solicitation of candidates, designed to attract the most qualified candidate for the position. The department chair will initiate faculty searches after consultation with the faculty and the dean.

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) 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

Discussions among the department chair and all faculty, preferably during a faculty meeting, that identify a critical need within the faculty will be the genesis of a faculty search. Based upon these discussions, the department chair will prepare a written document stating the need for and nature of a proposed faculty. The department chair will communicate his/her summary to the dean. The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

Once suitable faculty candidates have been identified through a search, the chair will negotiate with the chosen candidate a letter of offer that states the category and rank of the appointment and all agreed facets of the appointment including start date, salary, startup funds, moving expenses etc. The chair will coordinate preparation of the letter of offer with the dean or his designee. When complete, the chair shall inform the faculty of the successful appointment of the faculty.

B1. 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 entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within and outside of the department. Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college with resources from the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#). The search committee is responsible for the following:

- Appointing a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants and who will prepare a record of the committee's efforts to meet the diversity goals for university faculty.
- Developing a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, and salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Developing and implementing a plan for external advertising and directing solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day on-line advertisement in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure-track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated professional journal.

- Screening applications and letters of recommendation and presenting to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview preferably during a faculty meeting. If the department chair agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the search committee cannot identify candidates worthy of interview from the pool of applicants, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates must present a seminar to the faculty and graduate students demonstrating their scholarship. The public announcement of this presentation should indicate that it is associated with a search for faculty. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the search committee will solicit and summarize the opinions of the faculty to be included in their discussions. The search committee reports their recommendations to the department chair.

If the offer involves senior rank (associate professor or professor) or involves appointment with tenure, the department chair will solicit a formal vote by the CEF to determine the appropriateness of the proposed rank and resolve any issues of service credit. The CEF provides a written summary of its vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank and issues of prior service credit to the department chair.

The department chair determines which of the qualified candidates will be extended an offer. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair subject to any limitations imposed by the dean.

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

B2. Clinical Faculty

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

B3. Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class, and exceptions to a national search only require approval by the college dean.

The department chair, in discussions with the faculty, will determine the opportunity for a research appointment. The department chair will identify candidates for research positions. The Faculty Advisory Committee will aid and advise the department chair in searches for research faculty. Candidates will give a seminar and be available for discussions with all faculty. The public announcement of this presentation should indicate it is associated with a search for research faculty. The department chair will seek comments from all faculty regarding research candidates. The Faculty Advisory Committee will evaluate the candidate, comments from the faculty, and provide a written evaluation and recommendations to the department chair. The department chair will determine if a letter of offer will be provided to a candidate.

If the offer involves senior rank (associate professor or professor), the department chair will solicit a formal vote by the CEF to determine the appropriateness of the proposed rank and resolve any issues of service credit. The CEF provides a written summary of its vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank and issues of prior service credit to the department chair.

B4. Associated Faculty

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

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the FAC.

Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester-by-semester or annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Appointment Criteria above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

B5. Courtesy Appointment for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a Faculty Advisory Committee meeting. If the proposal is approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the Faculty Advisory Committee for a vote.

C. Withdrawal of Appointments

Appointments may be withdrawn under two circumstances: financial exigency (Faculty Rule [3335-05-02](#)) or when a faculty member has been found guilty of gross or serious incompetence, grave misconduct, or nontrivial financial fraud (Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#)).

V. Annual Review of Faculty Performance

A. Introduction

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>). Annual reviews will be based on the faculty's accomplishments during the calendar year.

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities (See Departmental Pattern of Administration section VI. Faculty Workloads, Duties, and Responsibilities, http://vet.osu.edu/assets/pdf/depts/biosciences/policies/VBS_PoA.pdf); on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. For probationary faculty the annual review will be used as one source of information during the evaluation for annual reappointment, contract renewal, promotion, or promotion and tenure. Probationary faculty will also provide their updated dossier for their annual review.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases. These materials must be provided in sufficient time for the chair to review prior to the annual review meeting.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

B. Procedures for Annual Review

B1. Initiation of the annual review process

The chairperson will initiate the annual review process by providing a letter to all faculty describing the nature, format, and time course of the process.

B2. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

Faculty with the rank of associate professor or professor are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss the faculty's performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. At the rank of associate professor, annual reviews become part of the faculty's dossier and will be used for promotion to the rank of professor. These reviews are one of the materials used to determine annual salary increases.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

B3. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair by meeting with the faculty member to discuss the faculty's performance as well as future plans and goals. The chair prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation regarding whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

If the faculty's annual review reveals significant deficiencies and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the candidate's complete dossier and review letters (with recommendations) from the CEF and departmental chair are forwarded to the college for review. The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

B4. Fourth-Year Review of Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

During the fourth year of the probationary period for tenure track faculty the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations may or may not be obtained and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the CEF determines that they are necessary to conduct an informed Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the CEF do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input, or the candidate wishes to demonstrate recognition by outside experts. If the probationary faculty member wishes to request that external evaluations be sought, this request needs to be communicated to the chair several months before the decision regarding renewal is required. Such requests are inappropriate at the time of the annual review meeting. The process of selecting external reviewers will be that outlined in section VII.G5, and the same pool of reviewers may be used in the fourth year and mandatory tenure review.

The CEF conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the CEF votes by written secret ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The CEF forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair.

The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments/review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the dean for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

The review at the college level for the fourth year renewal will be conducted as described in the college pattern of administration and appointment, promotion and tenure documents. The dean will make the final decision on each case. Reporting the results of these decisions and the opportunity for the probationary faculty to comment will follow the process described for promotion and tenure.

B5. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

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

B6. Annual Review of Clinical Faculty

The annual review process for probationary and non-probationary clinical faculty will follow the annual review process described for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively, except that non-probationary clinical faculty may participate in the review of clinical faculty of lower rank. The results of the annual reviews will become part of the faculty's dossier and will be one of the sources to evaluate the possibility of contract renewal.

In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue based upon available resources and need to address the departmental mission.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for contract renewal will be performed by the chair. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. Reappointment requires satisfactory fulfillment of contractual obligations as defined in the letter of offer and supportive annual reviews by the chair. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

B7. Annual Review of Research Faculty

The annual review process for research probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, except that non-probationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank.

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

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for contract renewal will be performed by the chair. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

B 8 . Annual Review of Associated and Courtesy Faculty

Associated faculty are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss the faculty's performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The chairperson will notify faculty with courtesy appointments of the necessity for review for reappointment approximately every three years. The courtesy faculty will provide to the chairperson a letter summarizing their accomplishments that further the mission of the department as well as a current curriculum vitae and whether they wish to continue their courtesy appointment in the Department of Veterinary Biosciences. The letter should address how the activities and accomplishments of the faculty have met the terms outlined in the initial appointment. For faculty wishing to continue their association with the department the chairperson will forward these documents to the Faculty Advisory Committee and ask their opinion as to whether the faculty has met the terms of the appointment. Upon receiving the recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Committee, the chairperson will inform the faculty if a courtesy appointment will be renewed. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

C. Documentation for Annual Reviews of Tenure-Track, Clinical and Research Faculty

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the following summary documents, be submitted to the department chair no later than the requested date.

- Current curriculum vitae

- Student evaluations
- Peer evaluations of Teaching
- Department form for annual reviews

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous calendar year. Faculty should not solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review. The following categories of information may be submitted as portions of the curriculum vitae, dossier, and the college form for annual review:

D1. Teaching

Summaries of core or elective courses taught as part of the veterinary professional curriculum or courses taught in other academic units should be submitted. Cumulative SEI reports for courses taught that are not part of the veterinary curriculum should also be submitted.

Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program may be submitted. Requests for these evaluations may be initiated by the faculty person or the departmental chair, and the reviewer assignment is made by the chair (see section X.B).

Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication and related to teaching may be submitted.

Other documentation of teaching such as summaries of new or reconstituted courses, awards received by the faculty, or awards received by students that have been directed by the faculty may be submitted.

Descriptions of new courses or courses that have undergone substantial updates should be provided.

D2. Scholarship

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

Documentation of grants or contracts awarded may be submitted.

Other relevant documentation of scholarship (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted) may be submitted.

D3. Service

Documentation of the scope and quality of service listed in the dossier may be submitted.

VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A. Criteria

Except when the university dictates any type of across the board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 36 months as documented by materials and summary of annual reviews, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor (including satisfactory professional behavior and consistent professional growth) and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year subsequent to the one 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 department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who upon evaluation may accept or modify these recommendations. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair provides faculty rankings based on annual evaluations (greatly exceeds, exceeds, meets and below expectations) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the department chair should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

C. Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described above be submitted to the department chair no later than the requested date.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Introduction

A1. Overview of the Roles of the CEF, Chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Dean

The primary evaluation of the faculty's accomplishments in comparison with the criteria contained in this document will be performed by the CEF. Departmental faculty are the best prepared to understand the teaching, research, and service of the individual seeking review in the context of the departmental mission. This evaluation and a subsequent vote regarding the requested action will be advisory to the department chair who will complete the review at the department level, prepare the department's recommendation, and forward it to the dean. The dean will seek review of the procedures followed and the rigor of the departmental review through the college promotion and tenure committee. Their review will be advisory to the dean. The dean will complete the college review process and forward the college recommendation to the provost.

A2. Mandatory and Non-mandatory Reviews

Mandatory reviews are required in the last year of a probationary appointment or contract and include tenure track faculty at the rank of assistant professor and tenure track faculty initially appointed without tenure. Review of faculty for promotion at other times is non-mandatory. Non-mandatory review is initiated by the faculty after consultation with the department chairperson during the annual review process.

A3. Non-mandatory Reviews Process

A core dossier, CV, annual reviews and teaching evaluations by students and peers for the last 5 years or since last promotion of the faculty member initiating a non-mandatory review will be provided to the CEF chair. The

CEF chair will identify the appropriate membership for the CEF and provide these faculty with the annual review documents for evaluation and a ballot indicating the CEF members will vote whether or not they support the review to go forward. Each CEF member will evaluate the materials. If the documents *clearly* do not support consideration for promotion or sufficient information (e.g., available student and peer evaluations) is not contained within the dossier, the CEF member will respond with a negative vote and a statement of the shortcomings. The CEF chair will tally negative votes and if the number of votes is greater than one third of the CEF members, the review will be stopped. If a non-mandatory review is stopped the CEF chair will summarize the CEF comments and inform both the faculty requesting the review and the departmental chair the result of the vote and the summary.

If the non-mandatory review is not stopped then no summary will be prepared and the CEF chair will inform both the faculty requesting the review and the departmental chairperson that the review will go forward. For nonprobationary tenure-track and clinical faculty, non-mandatory reviews can be stopped for only one year; a request for non-mandatory review following subsequent annual reviews will go forward without consultation of the CEF (Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)).

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 CEF committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident. Faculty members who lack citizenship or permanent residency may not be considered for review by this department.

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

A.5. Calendar for Mandatory and Non-mandatory Reviews of Faculty

Action	Time Frame	Responsible party
Notify department chair regarding action	April 1	Faculty Candidate
Provide review documents to CEF chair (for non-mandatory review only)	June 1	Faculty Candidate
Complete identification of external reviewers	July 1	Department Chair/ Faculty Candidate/CEF
Requested receipt date of external letters of review	August 15	Department Chair
Complete and submit dossier materials	September 1	Faculty Candidate
Present VBS seminar	May 1 to October 1	Faculty Candidate
Complete CEF review	November 1	CEF/CEF Chair
Inform the candidate of the results of the review	November 15	Department Chair
Complete department review	December 1	Department Chair

B. Criteria for Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

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

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

B1. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure: The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

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

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

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

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' [Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment

- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- treated students with respect and courtesy
- improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs
- served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching

Scholarship

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - quality, impact, quantity
 - unique contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work
 - rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues.
Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and original works more than edited works.
 - empirical work (i.e., creating new knowledge), demonstrating the candidate's ability to conduct such work and to mentor future scholars, is preferred to synthetic work (i.e., synthesis of existing knowledge) at this stage of career
 - Collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry. The candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, because it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review.
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.
- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- made substantive contributions to the governance of the department (e.g., service and leadership on committees, regular and active participation in meetings) in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others
- demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession

B2. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

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

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has

a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another.

In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

C. Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Faculty

The relative distribution of commitments will be defined by the letter of offer and modifications documented by the department chair and candidate in annual reviews or other appropriate documents. Evaluations should be made with flexibility in mind as positions may evolve depending on department needs. It is the responsibility of the faculty candidate and the department chair to appropriately document any changes in contractual obligations. Faculty members are encouraged not to view the following as set criteria for automatic promotion but as activities that are important to the mission of the department and college.

C1. Promotion to the Rank of Assistant Professor of Clinical Veterinary Biosciences

For promotion to assistant professor of clinical Veterinary Biosciences from the rank of instructor, a faculty member must complete a doctoral degree, and meet the required licensure/certification in their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service.

C2. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor of Clinical Veterinary Biosciences

For promotion to associate professor of clinical Veterinary Biosciences, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective up-to-date clinical service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice recognized at the local and/or regional level; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and administrative service for promotion to associate professor-clinical are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Scholarship is an expectation and is characterized as contributing to a body of knowledge and disseminating knowledge. Scholarship will be evaluated commensurate with the percent effort outlined in the letter of offer and annual reviews.

Teaching

The following are examples used in the evaluation of teaching:

- provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and

- appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- treated students with respect and courtesy
- improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs and service as a team leader if the opportunity is available
- engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching
- engaged in residency training, if in an appropriate discipline

Clinical Practice

The following are examples used in the evaluation of clinical practice:

- provides timely, reliable state of the art clinical practice as evidenced by feedback from stakeholders
- responsive to needs of stakeholders
- made contributions to the advancement of the clinical discipline
- shows evidence of commitment to professional specialty by involvement with societies relevant to the clinical specialty (e.g., membership, committee work, society officer)

Administrative service

The following are examples used in the evaluation of administrative service:

- served on departmental, college or other committees, commensurate with his/her distribution of effort
- made substantive contributions to the governance of the department (e.g., service and leadership on committees, regular and active participation in meetings) in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others

Scholarship

The following are examples used in the evaluation of scholarship:

- publications in professional journals that relate to the clinical specialty (e.g., case reports, retrospective studies, technical bulletins, etc.), reflect collaborative research support (e.g., pathology support for a study) or focus on the scholarship of teaching; publications in peer-reviewed journals are preferable
- publications of book chapters, presentations at national meetings, and invited presentations that draw from expertise in the clinical specialty
- funded scholarship as principal or co-investigator (acquisition of funding is not a requirement for promotion)

C3. Promotion to the Rank of Professor of Clinical Veterinary Biosciences

For promotion to the rank of professor of clinical Veterinary Biosciences, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; recognized leadership and reputation in their professional specialty at the national or international level; leadership in service to the department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Specific criteria in teaching, scholarship and service for promotion to the rank of professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

D. Criteria for Promotion of Research Faculty

D1. Promotion to the Rank of Research Assistant Professor

For promotion to research assistant professor from the rank of research instructor, a faculty member must complete his/her doctoral degree and be performing satisfactory scholarship.

D2. Promotion to the Rank of Research Associate Professor

For promotion to the rank of research associate professor, a faculty must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications and other works must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. Specific criteria for scholarship for promotion to the rank of associate professor are similar to those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

D3. Promotion to the Rank of Research Professor

For promotion to rank of research professor, a faculty must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Specific criteria for scholarship for promotion to the rank of professor are similar to those for tenure-track faculty.

E. Review Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure

E1. Procedures for Initiation of Reviews for Promotion and/or Tenure

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

E2. Procedural Guidelines for the CEF

Annually, the CEF will review this document and recommend proposed revisions.

Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, the CEF meets to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below. These actions need to be performed in the time frame described in Section VII.A5.

The CEF will select from among its members a POD who will serve in this role for the following year. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The POD's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines (<http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html/>).

The CEF will suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.

The POD reviews the candidate's dossier for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements (<http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html/>); and work with candidate to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

As necessary, the CEF chairperson should meet with each candidate to clarify issues regarding the preparation of the dossier or the review procedure. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

The chair of the CEF must obtain the materials appropriate for review typically through the departmental chair and provide these materials to the CEF members at least a week before the CEF meets.

The CEF chair must schedule a meeting for the committee to discuss the various actions.

Each CEF member has the responsibility to review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

Each CEF member has the responsibility to attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote to recommend or not to recommend the action at hand.

The administrative services sub-committee will draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service based on the CEF's discussion. Each CEF member has the responsibility to review and provide any comments regarding the draft letter from the administrative services committee regarding the outcome of the review. The CEF will revise the document as necessary. The final CEF recommendation will be signed by each member of the administrative services committee. The final CEF recommendation letter will include the summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting that include the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and service, the consensus or disparity of opinion in these areas, and the faculty vote. The final CEF recommendation letter will be forwarded to the department chairperson as well as members of the CEF. The final CEF recommendation letter will be included in the dossier.

If the candidate chooses to respond to the department's review, the chair of the CEF will provide the candidate's response to the each member of the CEF. Each CEF member has the right to provide responses to the CEF chair. The administrative services committee will summarize these comments and provide a written response on behalf of the CEF to any candidate comments that warrant response. This response will be included in the dossier.

E3. Procedural Guidelines for the Department Chairperson

Where relevant, the departmental chair will verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non- mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

The department chair will solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the CEF, the chair, and the candidate. (see section VII.G5)

The department chair will make each candidate's dossier and other relevant documents available for review through the CEF chairperson at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

The department chair may attend CEF meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed in order to best understand the points of deliberation as a non-voting participant.

The department chair will provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the CEF's completed evaluation and recommendation.

The department chair will meet with the CEF to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the CEF.

After completion of the department review process the chair will inform the candidate in writing of the availability of the evaluations by the CEF and department chair and the candidate's right to inspect these documents and if desired provide the chairperson with comments to either the CEF's or chair's letters within ten days for inclusion in the dossier.

The chair may provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

The chair will forward the completed dossier to the dean by the deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.

E.4 Responsibilities of the Candidate

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. While the CEF makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate. 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 meeting departmental deadlines for submission of the dossier.

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

Candidates are responsible to work with the department chair and the chair of the CEF to develop a list of external evaluators (see G5). A candidate may add no more than five additional names, but is not required to do so. A candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. See also "Procedures to Identify and Solicit External Reviewers" below.

Candidates will also develop a time line for a promotion seminar.

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

Note: Published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, copies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

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

E4a. Teaching

Materials since the last promotion or the last five years:

- Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar for classes external to those offered in the college.
- For those courses and rotations within the college
 - Summary table of student evaluation numerical data compiled by the candidate
 - Summary of student comments for courses and rotations in the professional program provided by Professional Programs
- evaluations by residents (one45)
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation policy (see section X)

- 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.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - mentoring of residents
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at local, national, and international conferences (with evaluations when available)
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges, universities or professional groups (or sharing of teaching materials with such institutions or groups)
 - completion of teaching development programs
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

E4b. Scholarship

Materials since the last promotion or the last five years:

- copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- documentation of grants and contracts received (award notices)
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
 - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options, and commercial licenses
 - announcements of prizes or awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

E4c. Clinical Practice

Materials since the last promotion or the last five years:

- service activities related to the clinical discipline as listed in the core dossier including:
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - consultation with industrial, educational, governmental, or private institutions
 - clinical practice (letter from stakeholders, formal evaluations of unit by internal and external panels)
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
 - service to professional organizations
- any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of clinical service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

E4d. Service

Materials since the last promotion or the last 5 years:

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including

- involvement with professional journals and professional societies
- consultation with industrial, educational, governmental, or private institutions
- clinical services
- administrative service to department (elected or appointed)
- administrative service to college (elected or appointed)
- administrative service to university and Student Life (elected or appointed)
- advising to student groups and organizations
- awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
- service to professional organizations
- any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

E5. Procedures to Identify and Solicit External Reviewers

Evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained from reviewers expert in the candidate's area for all reviews involving promotion or contract renewal in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research faculty contract renewal and promotion reviews, and promotion of clinical faculty.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State, except as noted. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure or contract renewal, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. Professionals at non-university research-intensive institutions who hold similar ranks may also be asked for evaluations.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory or descriptive. The chairperson's letter requesting an evaluation should ask the evaluator to refrain from judging the candidate according to the criteria of his or her institution.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited as described in section VII.A4.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the CEF, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. A dossier need not contain letters from external evaluators suggested by the candidate if the candidate has not provided suggestions or if the candidate's suggested external reviewers have not provided evaluations.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampleddocuments.html>.

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

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

VIII. Appeals

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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

IX. Seventh-Year Reviews

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

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

A1. Student Evaluations for Courses Taught Inside the College of Veterinary Medicine

Courses listed in the College of Veterinary Medicine are electronically evaluated by the Office of Educational Design and Systems (EDS). Student evaluations will be performed for all core and elective (currently opt-in) courses in accordance with EDS procedures. The evaluations of teaching are performed toward the end of semesters or at the conclusion of specific clinical rotations. EDS staff prepare summaries of the student's numeric responses that are sent to the faculty. When requested the EDS staff will prepare summaries of the comments provided by the students. These evaluations should be sought for each course taught and saved for annual reviews, contract renewals, promotions, and tenure decisions. This is the responsibility of the faculty member.

A2. Student Evaluations for Courses Taught Outside the College of Veterinary Medicine

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered outside the college. SEIs are electronically administered by personnel of the office of the Registrar (<http://registrar.osu.edu/faculty/sei/sei.asp>). Faculty should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation. The Registrar will provide output from these evaluations that should be saved for annual reviews, contract renewals, promotions, and tenure decisions. This is the responsibility of the faculty member.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

For the purpose of faculty evaluation during annual review or promotion/reappointment, peer evaluations of teaching have to be summative (an evaluation of the effectiveness of the instruction) with the inclusion of evaluative comments. Peer reviews will be performed for all faculty that perform instruction.

For faculty at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor, a minimum of one summative peer

evaluation/year are expected. Faculty at the rank of professor have to obtain one peer review every other year.

During the discussion of teaching assignments at the annual review, the department chair assigns one or more peer reviewers to evaluate the faculty's instruction in specific teaching assignments during the coming year. It is the responsibility of the department chair to identify the peer reviewer and share the assignments with both the faculty and peer reviewer.

Prior to each course undergoing peer review the faculty will arrange to meet with the peer reviewer. The time, date, and location for observation will be agreed and the faculty will provide copies of the course syllabus, notes, or other educational materials that are provided to the students. The faculty and the peer reviewer should discuss the nature and goals of the class, and the approach and teaching philosophy of the faculty. Prior to the class the peer reviewer will examine the materials provided by the faculty. The peer reviewer will observe one or more classes. Alternatively, peer review of non-classroom teaching such as clinical rotations or graduate training will require an alternative approach to observation that is agreed upon by the faculty and peer reviewer. The peer reviewer will prepare a summative report and provide copies to both the faculty and department chair. The faculty should keep a copy of the peer review for documentation and inclusion in annual review materials and the faculty's dossier.

Appendix

Responsibility for Dossier Materials

The faculty will be responsible for preparation of the dossier. The chair will aid by providing relevant materials. These will include: the annual reviews letters (from the chair), a summary of the external evaluators contacted (from the chair), sample of chair's letter sent to external evaluators (from the chair), summary of comments of student evaluations (candidate obtains from Professional Programs), evaluations of teaching from veterinary medical students (for didactic lectures/laboratories and clinical rotations), graduate students and residents, peer evaluations of teaching and evaluations from stakeholders of clinical services. All other materials are within the dossier and are the responsibility of the candidate. The candidate will consult with the POD to insure the completeness and accuracy of the dossier and additional materials prior to submission for review. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the documents to the POD with sufficient time for the review prior to the September 1 deadline or the June 1 deadline (see table, section VII.A5).

Documentation

The candidate should retain any materials that provide documentation for the information provided in the dossier. The following section outlines the types of documentation that may be available and should be saved as appropriate documentation. Letters or electronic communications inviting assignments, or recognizing your contributions to these activities should be saved as documentation. Information included in the documentation will vary depending upon the expectations for the candidate's appointment as outlined in this document.