APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES

FOR THE

DEPARTMENT OF VETERINARY CLINICAL SCIENCES
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Rustin M. Moore, DVM, PhD
Professor and Chair

Revised: 09/14/2012
# PATTERNS OF ADMINISTRATION FOR THE

Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Criteria, and Procedures

DEPARTMENT OF VETERINARY CLINICAL SCIENCES

COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Revised: 09/14/2012

## Table of Contents

I. Preamble .................................................................................................................. 1

II. Department Mission, Vision, Core Values and Guiding Principles ............................ 2

   A. Mission ....................................................................................................................... 2

   B. Vision, Core Values and Guiding Principles ................................................................. 2
      1. Group Values and Principles ................................................................................. 2
      2. Personal Values and Principles .............................................................................. 3

III. Definitions ............................................................................................................... 4

   A. Committee for the Eligible Faculty ............................................................................ 4
      1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty .............................................................................. 4
      2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty .............................................................................. 4
      3. Conflict of Interest .................................................................................................. 4
      4. Minimum Composition .......................................................................................... 5
   
   B. Department Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (DPTS) ...................................... 5
   
   C. Quorum ................................................................................................................... 5

   D. Recommendations from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (COEF) ................. 5
      1. Appointment ........................................................................................................... 5
      2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Contract Renewal ......................... 6

   E. Departmental Annual Review Committee (DARC) .................................................. 6

   F. Voting on Revisions of Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures .................................................................................................................. 6

IV. Appointments ......................................................................................................... 6

   A. Criteria ...................................................................................................................... 6
      1. Distribution of Effort ............................................................................................... 7
         a. Regular Tenure Track Faculty ............................................................................ 7
         b. Regular Clinical Track Faculty .......................................................................... 7
      2. Regular Tenure Track Faculty .............................................................................. 7
      3. Regular Clinical Track Faculty .............................................................................. 8
      4. Auxiliary Faculty ................................................................................................... 10
      5. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty ...................................................... 11
      6. Criteria for Emeritus Appointments ...................................................................... 11
   
   B. Procedures for Faculty Searches and Appointments .............................................. 11
      1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty .............................................................................. 11
      2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty .............................................................................. 13
      3. Transfer of Track ................................................................................................... 13
      4. Auxiliary Faculty ................................................................................................... 14
      5. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty ...................................................... 14
      6. Procedures for Emeritus Appointments ................................................................. 14

V. Procedures for Annual Reviews .............................................................................. 15

   A. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty ......................................................................... 16
      1. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty–Fourth Year Review .................................... 17
      2. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty–Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period 17
   
   B. Tenured Faculty ...................................................................................................... 18
      1. Associate Professors .............................................................................................. 18
      2. Professors ............................................................................................................... 18
C. Regular Clinical Track Faculty ................................................................. 18
D. Faculty with Joint or Adjunct Appointments ........................................ 19
E. Auxiliary Faculty .................................................................................. 19

VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards ............................................. 19
A. Criteria ....................................................................................................... 19
B. Procedures for Merit Raises ..................................................................... 20
C. Documentation for Merit Raises .............................................................. 21

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews ...................................... 21
A. Criteria ....................................................................................................... 21
  1. Guiding Principles .................................................................................. 21
  2. Teaching .................................................................................................. 22
  3. Mentoring ................................................................................................ 24
  4. Professional Development ..................................................................... 24
  5. Clinical Practice ..................................................................................... 25
  6. Scholarship ............................................................................................. 25
  7. Administrative Service ......................................................................... 26
  8. Professional Service ............................................................................... 26
  9. Interactions with Industry ...................................................................... 27
  10. Mutual Respect ...................................................................................... 27
  11. Commitment ......................................................................................... 28
  12. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure ..................................... 28
    a. Teaching ............................................................................................... 29
    b. Clinical Practice .................................................................................. 30
    c. Scholarship .......................................................................................... 30
      i. Publications ....................................................................................... 30
      ii. Research .......................................................................................... 31
d. Administrative Service .......................................................................... 32
  13. Promotion to Professor (or Tenure at the Rank of Professor) ............... 32
    a. Teaching ............................................................................................... 33
    b. Scholarship .......................................................................................... 34
      i. Publications ....................................................................................... 34
      ii. Research .......................................................................................... 35
c. Clinical Practice ...................................................................................... 37
d. Administrative Service .......................................................................... 38
  14. Promotion to Assistant Professor-Clinical ............................................ 36
    a. Teaching ............................................................................................... 36
    b. Clinical Practice .................................................................................. 36
    c. Administrative Service ....................................................................... 36
d. Scholarly Activity ................................................................................... 36
  15. Promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical ............................................ 36
    a. Teaching ............................................................................................... 37
    b. Clinical Practice .................................................................................. 37
c. Administrative Service ......................................................................... 38
d. Scholarly Activity ................................................................................... 38
      i. Publications ....................................................................................... 38
      ii. Research .......................................................................................... 38
  16. Promotion to Professor-Clinical .............................................................. 38
    a. Teaching ............................................................................................... 38
    b. Clinical Practice .................................................................................. 39
c. Administrative Service ......................................................................... 39
d. Scholarship ............................................................................................ 39
      i. Publications ....................................................................................... 39
      ii. Research .......................................................................................... 40
  17. Regular Faculty with Joint or Adjunct Appointments ............................ 40
B. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Reviews .................................................................................................................. 40
   1. Candidate Responsibilities ........................................................................................................................................ 40
   2. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (DPTS) Responsibilities ......................................................... 41
   3. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities (eligible faculty–COEF) ........................................ 43
   4. Department Chair Responsibilities ......................................................................................................................... 43
   5. External Evaluations .................................................................................................................................................. 44
   6. Documentation for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews ........................................................................... 45
      a. Teaching ................................................................................................................................................................. 46
         i. Lectures and Laboratories .................................................................................................................................. 46
         ii. Clinical Teaching ........................................................................................................................................... 46
         iii. House Office/Graduate Student Teaching ...................................................................................................... 46
         iv. Curriculum Development .................................................................................................................................. 46
         v. Continuing Education Instruction ..................................................................................................................... 46
         vi. Scholarship of Teaching .................................................................................................................................... 47
         vii. Teaching Portfolio ........................................................................................................................................... 47
         viii. Teaching Evaluations ....................................................................................................................................... 47
      b. Scholarship .............................................................................................................................................................. 48
         i. Publications ........................................................................................................................................................... 48
         ii. Research ............................................................................................................................................................... 48
      c. Clinical Practice ...................................................................................................................................................... 49
      d. Administrative Service ........................................................................................................................................... 49
      e. External Professional Service and Outreach ......................................................................................................... 49

VIII. Appeals ........................................................................................................................................................................ 50
IX. Seventh Year Reviews ...................................................................................................................................................... 50
X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching ................................................................................................... 50
   A. Student Evaluation of Teaching .................................................................................................................................. 50
   B. Peer Evaluations of Teaching ...................................................................................................................................... 50
   C. Continuing Education Evaluations ................................................................................................................................ 51

XI. Outcome Assessment – National Board Exam Reporting .................................................................................................. 51
Appendices ................................................................................................................................................... 52
A. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Guidelines .................................................................................. 53
B. Summary of Yearly Classroom and Laboratory Teaching ...................................................................... 62
C. Record of Peer-Reviewed Publications .................................................................................................. 64
D. Record of Funding .................................................................................................................................. 66
E. Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching .................... 68
F. Office of Educational Design and Systems Student Evaluation of Instruction ........................................ 69
G. Letter from Peer Evaluator of Teaching .............................................................................................. 80
H. Candidate Comment/Rebuttal Letter Form .......................................................................................... 81
I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html) 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 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 4 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 before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department’s mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-01.html) of the Administrative Code. Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment and promotion and tenure. Peers, usually colleagues in the tenure initiating unit, are those faculty members who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-02.html) 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, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university’s policy on equal opportunity (http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf).

At the time of appointment, all faculty members will be provided with a copy of this document. Faculty members will also be provided with an updated version when a revised document has been approved.
II. Departmental Mission, Vision, Core Values and Guiding Principles

A. Mission

The mission of the Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences is the advancement of animal health and well being through providing exceptional educational experiences, delivering outstanding veterinary care and discovering innovative methods to diagnose, prevent and treat disease. In support of these activities, we manage comprehensive professional and post-graduate curricula; provide leading-edge veterinary medical care; engage in consultation services and outreach activities that benefit the public and veterinary profession; and perform meaningful clinical, basic and translational research for the improvement of animal and human health.

B. Vision, Core Values and Guiding Principles

Our vision is to create and maintain academic, clinical, research and outreach programs that are recognized nationally and internationally for their quality and innovation. While striving toward this vision, we are mindful of values that guide our personal and collective works. Central to these are intellectual integrity, professionalism, innovation, commitment, accountability and a drive for excellence. These core values are representative of the standards and principles we embrace individually and collectively.

1. Group Values and Principles Guiding Department

- **Commitment to Programmatic Growth** – we will develop and advance our programs for the benefit of our students, animal health and the profession
- **Commitment to Public Service** – we serve the public through outstanding patient care, consultation, continuing education and outreach
- **Commitment to the Profession** – we serve our profession through consultation, engagement with professional societies and governing bodies, and by provision of continuing education
- **Commitment to our Students** – we believe that the education of our professional and post-graduate students is paramount
- **Discovery** – we strive to find better ways to improve animal and human health through clinical, basic and translational research
- **Impact** – we perform meaningful research that impacts and enhances animal health and veterinary medical care
- **Inclusiveness** – we value and encourage the participation of all members of our team in discussion and decision making
- **Innovation** – we advance our academic and clinical programs through personal creativity and collaborative innovation
- **Inspiration** – we motivate our students to embrace our profession and explore the many opportunities available to members of our profession
- **Involvement** – we understand that our personal engagement in departmental, college and university programs and service is pivotal for advancement of our departmental goals
- **Leadership** – we are active in our academic, hospital and specialty communities
- **Programmatic Goals** – we emphasize performance and outcomes as benchmarks of academic and clinical success
- **Quality** – we strive continuously for excellence in our teaching, research, clinical practice, service and outreach efforts
- **Responsibility** – we recognize our collective responsibilities for careful management and strategic optimization of resources
• **Teamwork** – we recognize that programmatic success depends on each of us working together selflessly towards our collective goals

2. **Personal Values and Principles Guiding Department**

- **Accountability** – we are answerable for our individual actions and responsibilities
- **Balance** – we seek an appropriate work-life balance
- **Clinical Expertise** – we strive to maintain and advance our clinical expertise
- **Collegiality** – we foster positive, collaborative relationships and interactions with faculty colleagues, staff and students
- **Communication** – we engage in honest, forthright, issue-oriented and civil dialogue
- **Compassion** – we treat our patients, students and colleagues with understanding, empathy and kindness
- **Composure** – we maintain a professional comportment during stressful events
- **Contribution** – we understand that our individual engagement and involvement in programs is critical to both programmatic and personal success
- **Efficiency** – we aim to improve our delivery of care and services while always maintaining focus on the quality of our work
- **Enthusiasm** – we value and foster enthusiasm and positive thinking
- **Ethics** – we embrace the importance of both personal and professional ethics in our work, behavior and lives
- **Hard Work** – we value individual initiative and personal dedication to the job
- **Humor** – we believe that appropriate humor can enhance the work environment and help people connect
- **Inquisitiveness** – we value curiosity and seek understanding
- **Integrity** – we approach academic issues, research and patient care ethically and with intellectual honesty
- **Learning** – we embrace life-long learning
- **Loyalty** – we value loyalty to our collective ideals, programs and colleagues
- **Open-mindedness** – we listen and openly and fairly consider new ideas or other viewpoints
- **Optimism** – we balance introspection, analysis and constructive criticism with a positive attitude and outlook regarding our programs, profession and people
- **Passion** – we sincerely care about our programs, students, colleagues, patients and clients
- **Persistence** – we celebrate diligence and determination
- **Professionalism** – we honor colleagues whose behavior reflects credit on our profession
- **Reflection** – we accept constructive criticism and hold personal accountability as pivotal to programmatic success and professional development
- **Respect for Differences** – we recognize, respect and value diversity as a source of strength
- **Satisfaction** – we believe that learning and working together create many opportunities for professional gratification and personal enjoyment
- **Service** – we embrace a “customer-oriented” approach in the delivery of patient and client care
- **Trust** – we appreciate that learning to trust each other is a fundamental step in achieving our vision of programmatic distinction
III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty (COEF)

1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

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

The eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of regular 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. The department chair may attend meetings at which (re)appointment, promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

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

2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

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

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

3. Conflict of Interest

When any one of the following conflicts of interest exist, a faculty member must excuse him/herself from the meeting of the eligible faculty until the discussion and voting on matters pertaining to appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure and promotion, or hiring of new faculty are completed.

- Familial or comparable close personal relationship with a candidate
- Professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., graduate degree advisor).
- Substantive financial ties with the candidate
- Has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an unbiased review of the candidate’s work is not possible. The Office of Academic Affairs’ Guidelines specify that faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate’s published works since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from review of the candidate. However, in our department where services are often small (<4 people) and input of service members is desirable at meetings where matters of promotion, promotion and tenure or other performance review are discussed, the issue
of conflict of interest with regard to input and voting will be decided on a case-by-case basis by the department chair in consultation with the DPTS.

- Any conflict of interest as defined by the University conflict of interest policy.
- Any other conflict of interest that could prevent objectivity.

Questions concerning a potential conflict of interest should be directed to the department chair who will decide if a conflict of interest exists and take appropriate action.

4. Minimum Composition

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

B. Department Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (DPTS)

The department Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (DPTS) assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (COEF) in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The DPTS consists of approximately 11 faculty members, including 7 non-probationary tenure track faculty members of whom at least 4 are professors, and 4 non-probationary clinical track faculty members, including 2 professors if possible. The chair may vary the composition of the committee to best represent the faculty as a whole. The committee’s chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible. The committee chair selects a Procedural Oversight Designee (POD) from among the committee’s members. The Procedural Oversight Designee’s responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs’ annually revised procedural guidelines.

C. Quorum

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

To be eligible to vote, a faculty member must be present at the meeting for the entire discussion of the candidate’s qualifications. Voting is by anonymous ballot.

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

D. Recommendations from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. The chair of the DPTS records the number of positive and negative votes and reports the results to the department chair.
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Contract Renewal

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

E. Departmental Annual Review Committee (DARC)

The DARC is a faculty advisory committee that reports to the chair, and is composed of the same faculty members as the DPTS. The DARC reviews annual reports, dossiers and teaching portfolios and votes on annual reappointments of all probationary faculty members. The DARC’s quorum and method of voting are identical to those of the DPTS. The chair of the DPTS, who is usually also the chair of the DARC, reports the results of the vote to the department chair, including abstentions, in a letter that summarizes the committee’s annual review of each probationary faculty member.

F. Voting on Revisions of Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

The following procedures apply:

• All regular faculty members will have access to the revised draft document for review and will have a minimum of 2 weeks to provide written comments to the DPTS.
• The draft document will be discussed at a minimum of one meeting of the regular faculty.
• The DPTS will revise the document taking into account the faculty input.
• The revised draft of the document will be available for a minimum of 5 working days to all regular faculty members who may provide written comments to the DPTS.
• Following discussion of faculty comments by the DPTS and the department chair, the chair may 1) declare the document complete and forward the document to the dean OR 2) declare that the regular faculty shall vote upon whether or not to accept the document. In the latter case, the regular faculty will vote by electronic ballot distributed by the Chair’s administrative assistant. Votes must be returned within 5 working days of the date of distribution of the ballot.
• Two thirds of the regular faculty must vote to accept the document in order for a positive decision to be declared. The chair votes with the regular faculty.
• The chair reports the results of the vote to the regular faculty. After the Chair has declared the document completed, or the faculty has voted, the draft document is submitted to the dean for approval.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

The department is committed to making faculty appointments that have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. In making appointments, the chair will attempt to balance the multiple academic missions of the department taking into consideration the needs of the Veterinary Medical Center (VMC). Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, clinical practice, research, administrative service and outreach activities; the potential for professional growth and sustained accomplishment in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a professional and collegial manner that will enhance their academic work and attract and retain other outstanding faculty and students in the department. In the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates
who would enhance the quality of the department, no offer will be extended. In this case, the search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances. The chair defines the terms of the appointments by the relative amount of responsibility assigned to each faculty member in teaching, clinical practice, research, outreach and administrative service. Assignment of effort is customized to maximize each faculty member’s potential for contributions to the department and for the benefit of the overall program. Assigned distribution of effort may vary substantially among faculty, both in tenure track and clinical track positions. Changes in distribution of effort are made by the chair in consultation with the faculty member, service head and faculty members within a given service. The distribution of effort is defined in the letter of offer and is redefined as necessary in the annual review letter and/or other appropriate written documents. Performance evaluations are based on assessment of the faculty member’s accomplishments in the context of his/her job description as articulated in the letter of offer and modified in subsequent annual review letters and/or other appropriate written documents.

1. Distribution of Effort

The following examples illustrate two commonly assigned distributions of effort in this department:

a. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

These examples represent faculty members who are assigned either approximately 24-26 or 12-13 weeks of clinical teaching and practice annually, the latter representing a faculty member with a research-intensive appointment. Vacation time cannot be substituted for clinical practice/teaching; however, a faculty member can arrange with another faculty member to cover clinical time, or can hire a qualified substitute clinician if sufficient release time funds are available, and with consultation with the respective service head, and with approval of the chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Teaching/Practice</th>
<th>26 weeks</th>
<th>13 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic Teaching/Research/Scholarly Activity/Administrative Service/Continuing Education/</td>
<td>22 weeks</td>
<td>35 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Meetings/Consultation</td>
<td>22 weeks</td>
<td>35 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52 weeks</td>
<td>52 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

This example represents a faculty member who is assigned approximately 36-38 weeks of clinical teaching/practice annually. Vacation time cannot be substituted for clinical teaching/practice; however, a faculty member can arrange with another faculty member to cover clinical time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Teaching/Patient Management</th>
<th>36-38 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic Teaching/Scholarly Activity/Administrative Service/Continuing Education/</td>
<td>10-12 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Meetings/Consultation</td>
<td>10-12 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

- **Instructor** – Appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but the candidate does not have a DVM degree (or equivalent), or the requirements for the doctoral degree have not been
completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the Instructor level is limited to three years. When an Instructor has not completed the requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year will be the terminal year of employment. Upon promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an Instructor. This request must be approved by the department’s COEF, the department chair, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal approved request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

- **Assistant Professor** – The criteria for appointment to Assistant Professor are 1) an earned doctor of veterinary medicine degree from an American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA)-accredited institution or equivalent educational background and qualification; 2) specialty training in the relevant clinical area or allied discipline with advancement toward appropriate certification, or possession of equivalent experience; 3) evidence of potential for sustained high quality scholarly activity and excellent clinical practice, teaching and administrative service to the Department and the profession. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the DPTS determines that such a review is appropriate. The faculty member will be informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. If the sixth year review is negative, the seventh year is a terminal appointment. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, and should be very carefully evaluated by the candidate as it cannot be revoked once granted. A faculty member may request an early review when ready. If the request for a non-mandatory review is turned down, the faculty member may resubmit the request the following year.

- **Associate Professor and Professor** – Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department’s criteria in teaching, clinical practice, research, outreach and administrative service for promotion to these ranks as specified in this document (See PROMOTION OR TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS). 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 ultimately approved for tenure when they have acquired the appropriate immigration status. The University cannot legally grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

3. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

Clinical track faculty members are critical to pursuit of the overall mission of the Department. Excellence in patient management, clinical teaching and clinical service is expected of clinical track faculty members as they will spend the majority of their time seeing patients, teaching students and training residents. Clinical track faculty members are expected to contribute new
information that advances clinical practice as the terms of their appointment permit. A faculty member may choose to pursue the scholarship of teaching, collaborative clinical research, and/or development of new clinical techniques. Clinical track faculty members should be efficient in their clinical practice thus helping to maximize case load. Although peer reviewed publications are not required, clinical track faculty members are expected to contribute to the literature in some manner, including authoring book chapters and participating in continuing education programs. Expectations for teaching, clinical practice, administrative service, scholarship and outreach will vary depending upon the nature of the faculty member’s appointment and responsibilities.

Regular clinical track faculty members are initially given a 3 to 5 year contract as per university rule 3335-7-07 A and B. Beyond this probationary period, reappointments are made for a term of not less than three and not greater than five years.

All reviews for promotion or for terms of reappointment require: 1) a dossier with associated documentation as described later in this document, 2) a teaching portfolio, and 3) copies of the annual review letters from the preceding five years. Letters from external evaluators are required for clinical track faculty in this Department when seeking promotion, but are not required for reappointment.

A recommendation from the Department will be one of the following:

1. Reappoint for a period of five years, with a recommendation for promotion
   OR
2. Reappoint for a period of three to five years at the existing rank
   OR
3. Non-reappointment after the fifth (or final) year of service of the current term of appointment.

Recommendations for three- to five-year reappointments are forwarded to the college promotion and tenure committee and the dean for approval. Positive recommendations to reappoint clinical track faculty will be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs without review and forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final action. The dean’s decision shall be final with respect to reappointment and non-reappointment and with respect to denial of promotion (according to University Rule 3335-7-08 (see http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules7/ru7-08.html). Faculty members are given appropriate written notice of non-reappointment in a timely fashion in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7-08.

Tenure is not granted to regular clinical track faculty. See Faculty Rule 3335-7 for more information http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules7/ru7-01.html.

- **Instructor-Clinical**: The criteria for appointment to Instructor-Clinical are 1) an earned doctor of veterinary medicine degree from an AVMA-accredited institution or equivalent educational background and qualification; and 2) a strong potential to attain reappointment and to advance through the faculty ranks. Preference will be given to individuals with advanced or specialty training in a clinical area.
  Appointment is normally made at the rank of Instructor-Clinical only when the appointee has not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment, or when other circumstances or criteria warrant such appointment.

- **Assistant Professor-Clinical**: The criteria for appointment to Assistant Professor-Clinical are 1) an earned doctor of veterinary medicine degree from an AVMA-accredited institution or equivalent educational background and qualification; 2) specialty training in the relevant clinical area with advancement toward appropriate certification, or possession of equivalent experience; and 3) a strong potential to
attain reappointment and to advance through the faculty ranks. Evidence of ability to teach and provide excellent clinical service (patient care, client service and consultation/referral services) is highly desirable.

- **Associate Professor-Clinical and Professor-Clinical:** The criteria for appointment to Associate Professor-Clinical and Professor-Clinical are that the candidate 1) meets the criteria for appointment to Assistant Professor-Clinical, 2) has obtained board certification in his/her specialty if an AVMA-approved specialty exists, or equivalent experience and 3) meets, at a minimum, the department's criteria — in teaching, clinical practice, administrative service, research and outreach — for promotion to these ranks.

4. Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary appointments are made for no more than one year at a time. For further information on auxiliary faculty appointments see University Rule 3335-5-19 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules5/ru5-19.html).

- **Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor:** Adjunct appointments are never compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the department, for which a faculty title is appropriate. This could include teaching the equivalent of one or more courses, advising house-officers/graduate students, serving on graduate committees and/or serving as a co-investigator on a research project. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty. In the event that the department wishes to compensate an adjunct faculty member for work other than the voluntary service for which the adjunct title is provided, a concurrent appointment of limited duration for lecturer, workshop leader, etc. may be added for that purpose.

- **Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor:** These auxiliary clinical appointments may be either compensated or not compensated. Auxiliary clinical rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular clinical track faculty. Auxiliary clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular clinical track faculty.

- **Lecturer:** Appointment as a lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a veterinary degree from an AVMA-approved college of veterinary medicine or equivalent training. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

- **Senior Lecturer:** Appointment as a senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a veterinary degree from an AVMA-approved college of veterinary medicine or equivalent training and at least 5 years of teaching experience. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

- **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50%:** Appointment at regular titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of auxiliary faculty with regular titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty.
Auxiliary faculty members with regular titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty.

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

5. **Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty**

Occasionally academic activity in the Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences of a faculty member from another department at The Ohio State University warrants an offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in our department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, participation in house-officer/graduate student advising, teaching a course, clinical practice and/or teaching, outreach, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current university rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

Courtesy appointments are usually not compensated but may be compensated in special circumstances. Courtesy appointments are recommended at the discretion of the chair after approval of the faculty in the clinical service to which the individual will be assigned. Continuation of a courtesy appointment should reflect ongoing contributions that meet expectations. Faculty with courtesy appointments will have no participation in governance at the departmental level, but may vote on matters when serving on ad hoc departmental committees.

6. **Criteria for Emeritus Appointments**

Emeritus faculty members are regular faculty who, upon retirement, can be recommended for emeritus status by the chair, the dean and the executive vice president and provost. Emeritus faculty members will be appointed in accordance with University policies and rules. Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters, but may have such other privileges as the department, college, or the university’s Office of Human Resources may provide.

B. **Procedures for Faculty Searches and Appointments**

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

- Recruitment of regular tenure track, clinical track 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.

1. **Regular Tenure Track Faculty**

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

The dean of the college approves the department chair’s request to initiate a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank and field of expertise.

The chair will consult with the faculty in the area that the interviewee may join, the prospective service head and the departmental Steering Committee prior to appointing an ad hoc faculty search committee consisting of three or more faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search, as well as other fields within the department and at least one staff member from the department or VMC. This committee represents the eligible faculty in the search process. The purpose of the consultation will be to assess the issues facing the department, including considerations emanating from strategic planning or programmatic review. These discussions will lead to a clear and precise charge to the search committee regarding the qualifications, characteristics and academic rank to be sought in a faculty candidate. The department chair will appoint one member of the search committee to act as its chair.

The search committee:

- Appoints 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 that each candidate receives fair treatment.
- Develops a position description based on the guidelines provided by the chair with input from the faculty. The position description should 1) identify responsibilities of the position; 2) explain the desired type of training and experience of applicants (including required and desired qualifications); 3) explain the importance of accomplishments to date in teaching, clinical practice, research, outreach and administrative service; and 4) enumerate indicators of potential to successfully work with faculty to advance the department’s mission and goals.
- Develops a search announcement for internal circulation in the University Personnel Postings (formerly known as the "green sheet") through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (http://hr.osu.edu) and for external advertising, subject to the 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, salary, etc. 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.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. 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.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the department chair a summary of those applicants (usually 3 to 5 depending on the search) judged worthy of interview. The department chair consults with the service head and dean prior to extending invitations to the candidate(s) to interview. On-campus interviews are arranged by the department chair’s office. If there is not agreement among search committee, department chair, service head and/or dean, then the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, and cancel the search for the time being) will be determined.
• Plays an integral role during onsite visit and interview of faculty candidates and members are expected to participate in various interview activities, including search committee meetings with the candidate, seminar, faculty forum, reception accompanying candidates to meals, and/or other opportunities to meet and visit.

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interactions with faculty members, including the search committee, graduate students/residents, the chair, and the dean or his/her designee. In addition, all tenure track candidates make a presentation on their research to the faculty and graduate students, and may be asked to teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. The chair may request that a candidate discuss a particular aspect of the faculty position applied for (such as how the candidate views his/her integration into the existing program in the department or how s/he envisions building the relevant program). All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same format with enough flexibility to accommodate candidates’ specific research interests. Faculty members will have an opportunity to assess each candidate by completing an evaluation form sent by email from the department chair’s office.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the search committee meets to discuss perceptions of each candidate and preferences; the department chair attends these meetings when possible to hear the conversation and feedback about all candidates. The search committee reviews the comments submitted by faculty members, determines which candidate(s) are acceptable and communicates this information to the chair. The chair consults with the regular faculty from the prospective faculty member’s service or relevant discipline. The chair reviews the comments of the search committee, individual faculty comments and comments from the service and, in consultation with these groups, prioritizes the acceptable candidates. After consultation with the dean, the chair begins negotiation for hiring with the top-ranked candidate(s). In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the chair decides after consultation with the service, other faculty and the dean of the college, which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the chair, with approval by the dean of the college. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process fails to yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search may be either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

If an offer of employment involves conferring senior rank (Associate Professor or Professor) then the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. The DPTS reviews the candidate’s application and advises the chair whether the candidate has met the department’s minimum requirements for appointment at the specified rank. The DPTS, in consultation with the chair, arranges a meeting of the COEF (the eligible faculty of the department). A member of the DPTS presents an overview of the candidate’s application and, after discussion, the eligible faculty vote. If the offer involves prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness at the proposed rank and/or the appropriateness of the prior service credit to the department chair.

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.

2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

Searches for regular clinical track faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus interview may
be on a topic related to clinical/professional practice or teaching rather than scholarship. Alternatively, clinical track faculty candidates may teach a class to the same audience, if agreed upon by the search committee and the department chair. Exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college dean.

3. Transfer of Track

Regular tenure track faculty may transfer to clinical track if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and the department chair, the college dean, the executive vice president and provost must approve the transfer. Department approval of the transfer should be based on the program needs and the mission of the department.

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 the regular clinical track to the tenure track are not permitted. Regular clinical track faculty members may apply for tenure track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

4. Auxiliary Faculty

The appointment, review and reappointment of all compensated auxiliary faculty are decided by the chair in consultation with the faculty in the prospective service to which the candidate would be assigned and the DPTS and the dean. The chair may choose to appoint a search committee to implement a search and interview process for auxiliary faculty comparable to that described for tenure track faculty.

Any clinical service area may request the appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty. The DPTS considers the proposal and if approved the chair extends an offer. A faculty ad hoc search committee to advise the chair may be needed for some auxiliary appointments.

Auxiliary appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All auxiliary appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester basis.

Auxiliary faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for regular tenure or clinical track faculty (see APPOINTMENT CRITERIA above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the University level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

5. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a regular faculty member from another department at The Ohio State University. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to our department and justifies the appointment is forwarded to the department chair. The department chair forwards the request to the DPTS, and if the proposal is approved by the DPTS (representing the eligible faculty) the department chair, after consultation with the dean, 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 for a
vote at a regular faculty meeting. Courtesy appointments remain in effect as long as the
appointee continues to make contributions to the program.

6. Procedures for Emeritus Appointments

The chair will consult with the faculty in the service to which the individual will be assigned, and
the dean of the college, regarding recommendations for emeritus appointments for retired
regular faculty members who will continue to contribute to the department’s programs.
Requests for emeritus status should include a short statement of justification from the
department and approval by the college. The emeritus request should be submitted at the time
of retirement whenever possible, but will also be accepted after the faculty member has retired.
The Board of Trustees provides emeritus faculty members with an emeritus parking decal.

V. Procedures for Annual Reviews

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual

The university and department mandate that all faculty members must have an annual written
performance review. The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected
performance proportionate to distribution of time and effort to various activities/responsibilities;
on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual’s job description; and on
progress toward promotion where relevant. Categories of assessment include but are not limited
to didactic and laboratory teaching, clinical practice and teaching, research and scholarship,
personal and professional development, outreach and external activities, service and
administrative service, professional behavior, and engagement and building of departmental
community.

The faculty member’s distribution of effort (teaching, clinical practice, research, outreach and
administrative service) is described in the letter of offer/appointment and is reiterated or
amended in subsequent annual review letters or other documents as necessary and
appropriate. The annual review is the primary time to adjust responsibilities and expectations
based upon performance and departmental, VMC and college needs. The annual review serves
as the basis for annual merit salary recommendations. The annual review assesses and
evaluates both accomplishments and future goals in the context of mission, performance
standards and expectations of the department, college and university. The annual review
assists the faculty member in developing and implementing professional plans, provides a forum
for discussion of accomplishments and identifies performance problems should they exist. An
accepted premise of faculty performance evaluation is that it is subjective.

The annual performance evaluation of each faculty member is the purview of the department
chair. In making his/her assessment, the chair considers the documents submitted by the faculty
member (Faculty Annual Report for activities and contributions between Jan 1st and Dec 31st of
the previous calendar year, dossier, student evaluations of teaching, teaching portfolio, and the
faculty member’s reflections on peer teaching evaluations in their teaching portfolio). Additional
materials including but not limited to the report of the Annual Review Committee (for
probationary faculty only), information from the service head, VMC director and/or faculty
member’s colleagues and co-workers, and the chair’s firsthand experience working with the
faculty member, will be considered in the overall assessment. The resulting comprehensive
evaluation is based on the chair’s subjective assessment of all this information/data in the
context of the expectations for performance as outlined in the faculty member’s previous letter
of appointment and/or annual review letters and in alignment with the distribution of time and
effort to various duties/responsibilities, goals, and needs of the department.
The documentation required of every faculty member for the annual performance review must be submitted to the chair no later than the Monday of the first week of February. The DARC will review documentation submitted by probationary faculty members. Eligible members of the DARC vote on the renewal of probationary faculty members. The chair of the DARC will write a letter to the department chair summarizing the views of the members of the committee and the results of the vote for reappointment (see DEPARTMENTAL VOTING PROCEDURES). Annual reviews will be conducted starting early in the spring semester and should be completed by the end of spring semester.

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to contact a member of the departmental administrative staff to schedule his/her annual review meeting with the chair. The staff member will coordinate the date, time and location of the meeting with the faculty member, and, in the case of probationary faculty, the service head or the chair of the faculty member’s mentoring committee, one of whom should also attend the annual review meeting (it is the choice of the probationary faculty member which person will accompany them to annual review meetings with the chair). All faculty members are responsible for preparing and submitting the required documents for the annual review in a timely manner. The chair will meet with the faculty member and then will write a letter that gives an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses, activities and contributions of the faculty member's performance and professional development, and, in the case of probationary faculty members, indicates whether the faculty member will be reappointed for an additional year. The chair will document any changes in the faculty member's distribution of effort in the annual review letter. A copy of the annual review letter is then submitted to the dean upon request.

Faculty members may submit a written response (letter of clarification or rebuttal) to the annual review letter for inclusion in their personnel file. They may prepare and submit such a letter within 10 days of the date of distribution of the annual review letters; the faculty member may request more time if needed.

University rules require that all annual review letters and attached response letters become a part of the faculty member’s official personnel file for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period and for the formal review for tenure and promotion.

For tenured faculty members, the dossier should include all annual review letters since the last Ohio State promotion or year of hire, not to exceed the most recent 5 years.

The department chair is required per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 (see http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules3/ru3-35.html) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 (see http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules5/ru5-04.html) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comments on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

**A. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty**

The annual review is a critical component in guiding the progress of every probationary tenure track faculty member and his/her future plans and goals. The goals of the annual review meeting are to allow the, service head or chair of the mentoring committee, and the chair to evaluate the progress of probationary faculty toward promotion and tenure; to assess the faculty member’s performance relative to his/her assigned distribution of effort; to encourage and provide guidance for professional development; and to discuss expectations for continued employment and advancement. The faculty member will be asked to describe his/her academic plan for the coming year and career goals. Statements made by the chair in the annual review meeting or in the annual performance review letter should not be construed as a guarantee of promotion if the specified goals are achieved as a “prescription” for academic advancement cannot be formulated.
The department will not renew a probationary appointment following any annual review in which it is apparent that the candidate’s likelihood of meeting expectations for future promotion and tenure is poor.

The Departmental Annual Review Committee (DARC) reviews the probationary faculty member’s annual report (mandatory college document), dossier, teaching portfolio, annual review letters, and SEIs for the year; advises the chair on the faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses and recommends for or against reappointment by a vote. The number of votes for and against reappointment as well as the number of abstentions must be reported to the department chair in the DARC’s letter summarizing its evaluation of each probationary faculty member. In making the final decision for annual reappointment of probationary faculty, the chair will consider the analysis and recommendations of the DARC along with additional input from the faculty member’s service head, the director of the Veterinary Medical Center (regarding clinical practice) and a member of the mentoring committee when appropriate. External evaluations of the faculty member’s work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for an annual review if judged appropriate by the DARC or chair.

If the chair and DARC recommend 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 distribution of effort for the coming year, future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The department chair’s letter (along with the faculty member’s comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college and becomes part of the faculty member’s cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure.

If either the DARC or the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process per faculty rule 3335-6-04 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-04.html) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty – Fourth Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluation are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. External evaluations are solicited only when either the department chair or the COEF determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate’s scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the COEF does not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

The COEF conducts a review of the candidate, aided by the DTSC, whose members prepare and present summaries of the candidates’ dossier, teaching portfolio, SEIs and other relevant materials during the meeting of the COEF. The presenter should not act as an advocate for the candidate but rather should provide a fair, complete and non-judgmental overview of the candidate’s activities and contributions. On completion of discussion of the candidate, the eligible faculty members vote by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The COEF forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of the performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the departmental review, the formal comments process per Faculty rule 3335-6-04 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-04.html) is concluded.
rules/rules6/ru6-04.html) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

2. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty-Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-03.html) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period, thus lengthening the time between hire and mandatory review for promotion and tenure. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html).

B. Tenured Faculty

1. Associate Professors

Professors review associate professors annually and submit a written performance review to the department chair along with comments on the faculty member’s progress toward promotion. The department chair conducts an annual review of Associate Professors following his/her review of the faculty documents. The chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written assessment on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review within 10 days of distribution of the annual review letter.

2. Professors

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair following a similar process as for Assistant and Associate Professors. The chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review to the chair within 10 days of distribution of the annual review letter.

Faculty on approved professional leave of absence (“sabbatical”) or special assignment (SA) will be requested by mail/email to complete an annual review report. If at all possible, annual reviews will be conducted with faculty on leave by telephone or in person in order to provide equal opportunity for evaluation for merit salary increases.

C. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

The annual review process for regular clinical track probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively. This includes the review of Associate Professors-Clinical by Professors (clinical and tenure track) in the department.

In the penultimate contract year of a regular clinical track faculty member’s appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. 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 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-07-8.html) must be observed.
If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. If the faculty member is being reviewed for reappointment without promotion, then his/her review follows the fourth year review procedures for regular tenure track faculty with 2 exceptions: 1) external letters of evaluation will not be solicited and 2) the college dean’s decision is final. If the clinical track faculty member is being reviewed for reappointment and promotion, then the review must follow the procedures for promotion and tenure of a probationary tenure track faculty.

All annual review letters and attached response letters shall become a part of the faculty member's official personnel file for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period. For formal reviews for 3-5 year reappointments, annual review letters since the last promotion or date of hire, not to exceed the most recent 5 years, should be included in the dossier documentation.

D. Faculty with Joint Appointments

Faculty with joint appointments whose TIU is in or out of the department will undergo an annual review in this department. The faculty member should request that the department chair assign other faculty members to complete formative peer evaluations of teaching for the joint appointee. The review will follow the same procedures as for regular faculty members of equivalent rank and shall include any letters from department chairs and/or center directors in which the faculty member may have a joint appointment as specified in the MOU on the joint appointment.

E. Auxiliary Faculty

We suggest that auxiliary faculty members submit a letter describing their engagement in and contributions to the department (for example, lectures given, attendance at rounds and/or journal clubs, teaching or research collaborations) during the last year as well as their plans for involvement in our program the next year. This will signal the auxiliary faculty member’s desire to continue the appointment. The chair in consultation with the chair of the DPTS and the faculty member who sponsored the auxiliary appointment will review the letter, and the chair will reappoint if appropriate.

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 travel funds, are made to recognize unique 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, clinical practice, research/scholarship, outreach and administrative service are 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, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high quality performance in areas of assigned distribution of effort and a pattern of consistent professional
growth will be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more of the areas of assigned distribution of effort are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases. Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the prescribed time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

The chair assesses the faculty member’s performance in the context of responsibilities, expectations and specific goals agreed upon at the beginning of the review period. Merit salary increases for tenure track faculty will be based on the quality of: 1) student and formative peer evaluations of teaching; 2) publication record in high-quality, influential scientific/education journals in the person’s field of specialization; 3) research support (both intramural and especially extramural) capable of maintaining an active and productive program that attracts and supports outstanding house staff, graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows; 4) contributions to hospital caseload and productivity through clinical activity, excellent client care and referring veterinarian service and outreach and engagement (community and industry); 5) awards or honors that recognize excellence in teaching, scholarship, or administrative service; 6) mentoring of professional and post-professional students and faculty; 7) administrative activity as reflected in taking an active or leadership role in national professional organizations or in committees or task forces of the service, department, hospital, college, or university governance; 8) invited scientific presentations at national and international meetings; 9) leadership role in the development of innovative approaches to teaching; 10) invited service on grant review panels of governmental funding agencies and private foundations; 11) service as editor or editorial board member for respected scientific journals; 12) collegiality, civility and high standards of professional behavior; and 13) other contributions to the missions of the service, department, hospital, college, or university.

Merit salary increases for clinical track faculty will be based on the quality of: 1) student and formative peer evaluations of teaching; 2) contributions to hospital case load and productivity through clinical activity, excellent client care and referring veterinarian service, and outreach and engagement (community and industry); 3) leadership role in the development of innovative approaches to teaching; 4) publication of results of collaborative research, case reviews, retrospective studies, clinical trials, and/or manuscripts relevant to the scholarship of teaching; 5) awards or honors that recognize excellence in teaching, service, or scholarship; 6) mentoring of professional and post-professional students and faculty; 7) administrative activity including taking an active or leadership role in national professional organizations or in committees or task forces of the service, department, hospital (VMC), college, or university governance; 8) invited presentations at national and international meetings; 9) service as editor or editorial board member for respected professional journals; 10) collegiality, civility and high standards of professional behavior; and 11) other contributions to the missions of the service, department, hospital (VMC), college, or university.

Professional and collegial behavior will be assessed across all areas/categories and how this positively or negatively impacts contributions to the program and the working and learning environments. Collegial, cooperative and professional interactions and behaviors can enhance programmatic contributions and working and learning environments, whereas inappropriate, disruptive, unprofessional, non-collegial or similar behaviors can offset or overshadow academic accomplishments and contributions. Thus, professional or unprofessional behavior can affect merit-based salary increases in a positive or negative manner, respectively. Collegiality may not be used as a fourth criterion for evaluation of performance; rather, faculty members are expected to behave in ways that ensure a supportive environment that fosters excellence in teaching, research and patient care.

The overall summary assessment resulting from the annual review will be used as the basis of distribution of merit-based salary increases. This can then be modified based upon a number of
factors, including but not limited to market and equity as well as issues related to disruptive, non-collegial or unprofessional behaviors that negatively impact the working and learning environments for others.

Faculty who have been on an approved professional leave of absence ("sabbatical ") or special assignment (SA) leave during the academic year are reviewed using the same criteria.

B. Procedures for Merit Raises

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who reviews the recommendations together with input from the Associate Deans for Research and Graduate Studies, Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, and the director of the VMC who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated as dollar amounts rather than percentages increases with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the chair divides faculty into at least five groups based on continuing productivity (exceeds, meets to exceeds, meets, partially meets, does not meet expectations) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

Faculty members who wish to discuss their salary increase with the chair should be prepared to explain why their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

Each faculty member will receive annual written notification of their approved salary, effective September 1.

C. Documentation for Merit Raises

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the chair by the specified deadline. The focus of the review is the previous calendar (Jan. 1 to Dec. 31) year.

- College Annual Faculty Report, in part generated from Research in View. Covers the previous calendar year.

- Updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (see http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html, Volume 3), including list of formative peer reviews of teaching.

- Teaching Portfolio, containing reflections on formative peer reviews of teaching (See Appendix F.

- A list of peer reviewers of teaching during the previous year, the date of the review, the title of the lecture, laboratory or clinical teaching evaluated, and the relevant course number.

- Copies of student assessment of teaching for the year (summaries provided by Educational Design and Systems), including scores and individual comments.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria

1. Guiding Principles
Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (D) (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-02.html) provides the following general criteria 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.**

The university recognizes that a diversity of paths to promotion to professor benefits both the faculty member and the institution.

**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.**

The Ohio State University expects faculty members seeking tenure and promotion or promotion to demonstrate a level of scholarly activity and engagement that ensures continued productivity following the awarding of tenure. At The Ohio State University, the decision to grant tenure to a faculty member is based on a subjective assessment of the documentation of the candidate’s accomplishments by his/her peers, and by senior administrators of the department, college and The Office of Academic Affairs. The pattern of past performance should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

In this department, academic achievement is judged in the context of the mission of the department and the expectations for distribution of effort that have been specifically recorded by the chair in the letter of offer. Changes in distribution of effort are specified in the chair’s annual review letter or other appropriate written documents for the individual faculty member. At the tenure review or reappointment, candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching; clinical practice (if assigned); research/scholarship (dependent upon appointment, tenure track or clinical track, and percentage distribution of effort); outreach; administrative service to the department, college or university; and professional service to the VMC.

The department has high standards for the awarding of promotions, as these have a powerful impact on the quality and future of the department. Criteria will vary according to the particular responsibilities of each faculty member, whether the faculty member is on the clinical or tenure track and whether the decision is for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. The department values enthusiasm, innovation, creativity, intellectual diversity and open-mindedness.

The department is committed to academic freedom and its associated responsibilities as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-01 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules5/ru5-01.html) and consistent with the American Council on Education statement on academic rights and responsibilities (http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=HENA&template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=10672). The department encourages free expression and faculty members should be open to new ideas and respectful of the ideas and opinions of others.

### 2. Teaching
All faculty members are expected to excel at teaching, to continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness, and to contribute to the development of instructional programs. Faculty members are expected to teach on several teaching teams, to participate actively in course planning and implementation and to work toward constant improvement of the course as a whole. Faculty members are also expected to assume the role of teaching team leader and a position on the college’s Council on Education and/or Curriculum Committee, when appropriate.

In addition to providing an excellent professional student curriculum, the training of clinical house officer/graduate students is an important and critical mission of the department. House officers are graduate veterinarians in nationally-approved specialty training programs that lead to advanced clinical training and/or board certification in a clinical specialty recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association. A major goal of the department is to train veterinary specialists who will advance the standard of care of their patients and contribute new knowledge to their specialty areas. Residency and internship training in the department is based on an intensive, structured, three-year or one-year program, respectively, composed of extensive, mentored clinical training and participation in a comprehensive series of courses, seminars, rounds, journal clubs, conferences and independent study experiences within the department. All faculty members in the department are expected to contribute to these programs, proportionate to their assigned distribution of time and effort.

Student evaluations of teaching are required of all faculty members. Because nearly all courses in the veterinary professional curriculum are team taught, most standard course evaluations in the college reflect the combined efforts of the teaching team rather than the effort of an individual faculty member. The weight placed on overall course evaluations depends on the faculty member’s contribution to the course; for example, overall course evaluations are most important for teaching team leaders. Individual instructor evaluations are therefore required. The chair’s office is responsible for registering new faculty with the college’s Office of Educational Design and Systems (EDS). This office circulates an electronic request form before each semester on which faculty members must register their desire to be evaluated. It is the expectation and responsibility of all faculty members to register with EDS for all of their core and elective pre-clinical didactic and laboratory teaching. The EDS office will then initiate the teaching evaluation process. Faculty members are also expected to undergo evaluation by students for the clinical teaching; this process currently is facilitated by the evaluation feature in the web-based program (one45) the college uses for management of the clinical rotations.

Peer reviews of teaching are also required. Assistant and Associate Professors members are expected to undergo at least two formative peer reviews annually of teaching (didactic, laboratory, and/or clinical) of professional veterinary students, house officers or graduate students. Professors are required to have 2 peer reviews every 2 years. The peer review process for the Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences is described in Appendix F. Our peer review process is based on formative rather than summative reviews, and therefore the reviews are not included in the candidate’s dossier or teaching portfolio. Mentoring committee members arrange to peer review the teaching of their faculty mentees, and then to discuss the review with them. The formative review is made available to the mentee, who considers the recommendations and writes a self-reflective summary of how this review may change or advance his/her teaching. This self-assessment is included in the teaching portfolio. Faculty members who perform a peer review of teaching receive academic credit for this endeavor. A list of all peer reviewers of teaching, the date of the review, the title of the lecture, laboratory or clinical teaching evaluated, and the relevant course number should be included in the dossier to document such reviews have occurred. The actual written evaluation forms should not be included in the dossier, rather a reflective summary of this feedback and how it will be used to modify or enhance teaching in the future should be entered into the teaching portfolio.

The department recognizes education outside of the university as an important part of its mission. Faculty members provide continuing education, while themselves engaging in lifelong
learning, through publications, presentations and communications. Outreach educational efforts by faculty members speed dissemination of new knowledge and make cutting-edge information available in a well-integrated form, thereby promoting the international and national reputation of the department, the college and the university. Invitations to speak at international, national and regional continuing education programs reflect the stature of the faculty member as a clinician and educator in her/his specialty area. However, it is equally important that departmental faculty focus appropriate time and effort on local, state and regional continuing education in order to promote awareness among private practitioners and the animal-owning public about our clinical services and capabilities. There is an expectation that all faculty members participate in a minimum of 2 local or state meetings in Ohio or the surrounding states each year. This will help foster maintenance and growth of a robust and diverse clinical caseload that is important for teaching students, training residents, clinical research, and for the financial health of the VMC. Time devoted to outreach activities should not compromise the faculty member’s commitment to his/her assigned duties or have a negative impact on the operation and sustainability of the service or on faculty colleagues. When questions regarding conflict of commitment arise, the faculty member should consult the chair.

Publication of books, book chapters, monographs and articles that communicate the state of the art of veterinary medicine in the candidate’s specialty area are viewed as important contributions to teaching and outreach, particularly for Associate Professors who have selected teaching and clinical practice as their career focus areas. Assistant Professors on the tenure track should concentrate on peer-reviewed scholarly publications and other scholarly endeavors.

Some faculty members also provide education to private veterinary practitioners and the general public through telephone communications, electronic media, extension courses and other activities. The average Faculty member is expected to efficiently and cooperatively respond to daily telephone or e-mail requests for information from veterinary colleagues and the general public.

All faculty members are expected to develop and maintain a comprehensive, relevant and current teaching portfolio. A teaching portfolio can highlight one’s contributions to pre-clinical and clinical education of veterinary students and compliments one’s dossier. A teaching portfolio should be a dynamic document which is updated regularly. Faculty should provide a representative example of teaching materials for one lecture, including syllabus, learning objectives, lecture notes, PowerPoint presentation, and exam questions. Additionally, a list of online/E-learning resources developed and a representative example(s) is appropriate to include in the teaching portfolio. Numerous resources are available at (http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching_portfolio) as well as a departmental document, located under the Faculty Resources folder on the VCS shared drive (V:\VCS\Faculty Resources\Teaching Portfolios).

3. Mentoring

Faculty members are expected to actively participate in and meaningfully contribute to the professional development of faculty members, especially those early in their careers, and trainees through a commitment to effective mentorship, including serving on the mentoring committee(s). Faculty members are expected to actively foster an enriching and supportive working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions. Faculty mentors receive academic credit for this activity.

The department views the role of faculty in advising house officers and graduate students as critical to its mission. Each house officer/resident/intern is assigned a faculty member as the clinical training advisor. The training advisor is responsible for mentoring the individual through all aspects of the clinical program, and must certify that the individual has obtained sufficient
clinical expertise and knowledge to be qualified for the board certification examination in his/her chosen specialty. Residents dual-enrolled in graduate school must successfully complete their graduate course work and research (successfully defend thesis/dissertation) to successfully complete their residency program. In such cases, failure to complete the dual graduate degree equates to unsuccessfully completing the residency program and the department and chair will not sign off on the necessary paperwork for specialty board certification. Each graduate student is assigned a research advisor who may or may not be the same person as the clinical training advisor.

Faculty members are also expected to advise professional students by facilitating student projects, writing recommendation letters, consulting with prospective employers regarding job placement, mentoring and advising student organizations among other activities.

4. Professional Development

Faculty members are expected to attend and participate in the department’s regular Faculty Professional Development Seminar Series, including serving as speakers, panelists and facilitators. Additionally, they are encouraged and expected to seek and participate in other professional and leadership development opportunities within the college, university, their discipline/specialty and the veterinary profession.

5. Clinical Practice

A strong teaching hospital or academic veterinary medical center is fundamental to the mission of the college. The Veterinary Medical Center (VMC) requires committed and highly trained specialists and clinical educators to maintain a state-of-the-art hospital and clinical practice. The majority of patient management is conducted concurrently with professional student and house officer/graduate student training and education. Faculty members are expected to practice ethical state-of-the-art clinical medicine and to provide effective supervision and oversight of the clinical education of students and house officers in the VMC.

A strong commitment to excellence in clinical practice, including excellent patient management, exceptional client care, consultation and referral services to private veterinary practitioners; meaningful clinical outreach; efficient and sound business practices; and following VMC policies and procedures is expected of all faculty members who work in the VMC or other satellite areas, including ambulatory practice. Specifically, faculty members are expected to:

- Practice state-of-the-art diagnosis and management of patients referred by local, state and regional veterinarians as well as patients presented by the hospital’s local clientele
- Maintain effective and timely communication with clients by telephone, e-mail and letters concerning medical and surgical management of their pets. These communications are critical to cultivating long-term relationships with our clients and fostering a robust caseload.
- Maintain effective and timely communication with referring veterinarians by telephone, e-mail and referral letters concerning management of referred cases. These communications are critical to cultivating long-term relationships with our alumni and private practitioners and fostering a robust caseload.
- Accurately complete all medical records in a timely fashion to promote efficient patient management as well as to provide information for clinical research and for legal purposes.
- Provide timely and accurate estimates of costs to clients to facilitate efficient billing. These activities are crucial for effectively managing client expectations, critical to the financial well-being and sustainability of the VMC, and they support clinical education.
- Foster efficiency among members of the clinical teaching team in managing a large number of patients, while simultaneously maximizing the educational value of these patients.
• Recruit new clients to provide a large and diverse caseload, which facilitates the teaching mission of the VMC.
• Comply and adhere to all VMC policies and procedures.
• Consult with, students, residents and other faculty members regarding hospitalized patients.
• Consult with practicing veterinarians locally, regionally and nationally concerning state-of-the-art patient management.
• Engage in outreach to the animal-owning public and industry constituents.
• Perform all duties with competence, professionalism and accountability.

6. Scholarship

Strong clinical, applied, translational and basic science research programs are an important mission of the department. Scholarly activity is focused on the discovery of new knowledge that advances state-of-the-art of veterinary medicine; improves the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of spontaneous disease in animals; furthers our understanding of mechanisms of disease and advances the study of animal models of human disease. Research is accomplished in a variety of formats including, but not limited to, studies of spontaneously occurring diseases, experiments in vitro and on laboratory animals, prospective clinical trials, investigation and development of new drugs and new uses of existing drugs and studies of new surgical techniques, devices or diagnostic methods. Case reports and retrospective studies can serve as building blocks for additional studies such as prospective clinical trials. All faculty members who work in the VMC are expected to participate at some level either as a principal or co-investigator or in a collaborative role in discovery. For example, case recruitment/enrollment in clinical trials, which is important to help foster new discoveries and advancement of clinical veterinary medicine.

Scholarship may also involve discovery, implementation and dissemination of innovative instructional technologies and more effective teaching methods. These pedagogical contributions should be based upon appropriately conducted outcomes assessments and published in peer-reviewed education journals.

Scholarship should adhere to the standards of clear goals, thorough preparation, appropriate methods, reportable results, effective communication and reflective critique. All research, including clinical and teaching research, must adhere to conventional scientific methods of establishing a hypothesis, developing an experimental protocol, collecting results, analyzing data and reporting the results to the scientific community in a timely fashion. Associate professors, in consultation with the department chair, will select focus areas within the department’s broader mission that will become the basis of their contributions to the department’s programs. The tenure track candidate is expected to establish a focused area of research and/or a clinical specialty from which publications suitable for peer-review in high quality journals will be developed.

Expectations for scholarly accomplishments for clinical track faculty are proportional to the amount of time available for scholarly activity.

7. Administrative Service

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the quality of academic life by participation in departmental, hospital, and college governance and service activities as a member or chair of a committee, in a supervisory or leadership role related to unit activities, as a member of a standing or ad hoc committee or task force, via service as a unit representative, as a participant in routine unit governance and in public relations efforts that enhance the visibility and image of the unit. Visiting veterinarians or veterinary practices as outreach to develop and foster relationships helpful to sustain or enhance case referrals is important and valued. Public
relations efforts may include attending special events, developing websites, providing interviews, or writing lay articles. Attendance and participation in service (e.g., service meetings, journal and book clubs, clinicopathologic case conference, and resident case rounds); department (e.g., faculty professional development seminars, research seminar, faculty meetings, and academic committee meetings); VMC (e.g., service meetings, VMC board meetings, and committee meetings); and college (e.g., college committees, faculty forums, and other college activities and functions) are encouraged, expected and valued.

A faculty member cannot be active in all of these service areas, but participation in selected areas is necessary for the professional growth of the faculty member and for achievement of the goals of the VMC, department and college. At a minimum, all faculty members in the department must participate in the activities and governance of their assigned service. Active participation and contribution to committees, task forces or other activities are important, including meeting obligations, responsibilities and timelines, rather than just being a member of such groups.

8. Professional Service

Faculty members are expected to serve their professional organizations. This activity helps to maintain the national and international reputation of the department, college and university. Active participation is encouraged for the professional growth of faculty members and may include service as an officer, committee member, member of a credentialing or examining board, member of an advisory board, program organizer for scientific meetings, grant reviewer, journal reviewer, journal editor, or invited panelist.

9. Interactions with Industry

Faculty members may be expected to interact with industry constituents to maintain and promote better working relationships that may be vital to the growth and advancement of the department, VMC, and/or college by providing faculty members access to state-of-the-art technology and/or enhanced contractual funding. Faculty can provide expertise and creative ideas to industry to foster the links between industry and the university. Faculty should file Confidential Disclosure Agreements, and be aware and take the necessary steps to ensure protection of intellectual property, including consulting with the office of Technology Licensing and Commercialization and the college Office of Research and Graduate Studies.

10. Mutual Respect

Excellence in teaching, patient care, research, outreach and administrative service are defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics (http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm).

a. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end, professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self discipline and judgment in using, extending and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

b. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as
intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

c. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

d. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

e. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Collegiality, civility, mutual support and respect for others are strongly held values in the College of Veterinary Medicine. The department and college support diverse beliefs and the free exchange of ideas and expect that faculty, staff and students promote these values and apply them in a professional manner in all academic endeavors. The department is committed to evaluating the practice of these core values as part of all performance evaluations. In all aspects of their work, faculty members are expected to demonstrate collegial, civil, responsible and respectful behavior toward peers, staff, students, referring veterinarians and VMC clients. Faculty members are encouraged to establish and maintain a rapport with their colleagues. Both personal accomplishments and involvement as a team member in teaching, clinical practice, research, scholarship, mentoring, outreach and/or administrative service are valued. Each faculty member contributes indirectly to department productivity by positively influencing the productivity of other faculty members. This synergism may also include positive interactions in research collaboration, co-authorship of publications, sharing of innovative ideas in committee meetings, community and industry outreach. All faculty members should work toward establishing and maintaining a team culture and an enriching and diverse intellectual working and learning environments.

11. Commitment

Successful faculty members periodically assess their past accomplishments and future goals. They stay focused on their goals, but are also receptive to new responsibilities when asked by their chair, service head, or faculty colleagues. Faculty members are encouraged to stay current
in new developments and concepts in their field by attending appropriate conferences (within and outside of the department) and reading current scientific literature. Faculty members should strive for a balance of professional and academic commitments, and should avoid over-commitment.

12. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure (or Awarding Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor)

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) provides general criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

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. Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

Every candidate must meet departmental expectations in all aspects of performance, as defined for each faculty member in their letter of offer or subsequent annual review letters from the department chair. When making a tenure decision, accepting performance that does not meet expectations in any aspect of a faculty member’s job is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department’s ability to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate’s primary role is and will continue to be teaching professional students, then excellence in teaching professional students is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counter balanced by excellent performance in another aspect of the job that is a significantly smaller part of the individual’s responsibilities.

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, clinical practice, research, outreach and administrative service are expected of faculty for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. Probationary faculty members are expected to develop a local and national reputation among their peers for excellence in teaching, clinical practice and research. 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.

A faculty member may choose to remain indefinitely at the rank of tenured Associate Professor; however, this would not be consistent with the goals of the department, college or university regarding career advancement of faculty.

a. 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 and 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. For example, the department encourages the use of clickers/Turning Point audience response devices and Carmen-based problem solving exercises.
- 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 an advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department’s graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member’s area of expertise.
• Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.
• Demonstrated growth and development as a teacher/educator through formative peer review and reflection as documented in teaching portfolio.

The department evaluates quality and quantity of teaching effort based on the terms of the faculty member’s appointment. For example, a faculty member with 26 weeks of annual clinical practice responsibilities is also expected to give didactic lectures and participate in laboratory instruction annually in the professional or graduate student curriculum, in addition to participating in 26 weeks of clinical teaching. A documented record of effective teaching is required of all faculty members and is composed of student and formative peer evaluations of classroom and clinical teaching, which should be included in the dossier and teaching portfolio.

Each faculty member is expected to obtain Category M or P Graduate Faculty status. Category M faculty members have a regular tenure or clinical track appointment and a Master of Science Degree (or equivalent, including a DVM/VMD) or a PhD. Category P faculty members must have earned a PhD, DMA, EdD or equivalent and must be engaged in an active program of research, scholarship or creative study, or must demonstrate significant promise of establishing such a program. The college Council for Graduate Studies is responsible for processing requests for membership in the graduate faculty and category M or P status. See the college Graduate Studies Handbook for a detailed explanation.

Graduate student advisors mentor graduate students in their research and all other aspects of the degree program. All probationary tenure track faculty members are expected to serve on graduate committees prior to promotion and tenure. The department is unique in that faculty members may serve in two roles for house-officer/graduate students: research advisor and/or mentor of clinical training. The department recognizes the contribution of faculty members to both house-officer mentorship and graduate student advising.

b. Clinical Practice

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:
• Demonstrated clinical competence and commitment by being present and actively involved in the management of patients on the service he/she is assigned and providing appropriate levels of supervision and oversight of house officers and students.
• Supported the mission of the VMC by providing excellent and timely communication and service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio.
• Demonstrated the ability to manage all duties that are essential for the efficient function of the VMC. The input of the director of the VMC on these issues will be solicited.
• Developed a local and national reputation among peers for excellence in and advancement of clinical practice.
• Achievement of specialty board certification if appropriate and available.

c. Scholarship

i. Publications

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:
• Published a thematically focused body of research/scholarship work in high quality peer-reviewed journals that contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise shows evidence of influence on the work of others.
• Published in scientific journals judged to be of high quality by the department. Journals whose emphasis is predominantly or exclusively continuing education for practicing veterinarians or the general public are usually not acceptable. Presentation of abstracts at scientific meetings, although expected for dissemination of new information, does not replace the requirement for publication. All publications contribute to the candidate’s body of work; however, primary authorship of original research articles in high quality peer-reviewed (refereed) journals is emphasized as the highest priority. Faculty members should have manuscripts of this type demonstrating their own independent work. Second authorship of papers behind a house officer/graduate student is considered to be “first co-author” provided that the faculty member’s percent contribution supports this assessment. The department recognizes that some peer-reviewed journals follow the convention of listing the senior author last. These publications can be considered of equivalent merit to first co-author publications provided that the faculty member’s percent contribution supports this assessment. Books, book chapters, non-refereed articles, proceedings and other written works are a lower priority than peer-reviewed scientific articles for probationary tenure track faculty.
• Developed a local and national reputation for excellence among peers 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 favorable citations in other researchers’ publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research/scholarship contribution is desirable rather than one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member’s frequent attendance at national and international conferences.

The department evaluates quality, quantity and impact of scholarship in the context of the terms of the faculty member’s appointment. Faculty members are expected to publish reports of the results of original studies or substantial case series. Single case reports are less desirable. For faculty with varying percent distribution of effort for clinical teaching and practice, and classroom teaching, the expectation for first author and co-first author publications will be adjusted proportionately. For example, a faculty member assigned 12 weeks of clinical teaching and patient care annually would be expected to author proportionally more peer-reviewed publications annually than a faculty member with a 26-week annual commitment to clinical teaching and practice.

The department recognizes the scholarship of teaching. A faculty member may elect to pursue excellence in the scholarship of teaching as his/her area of scholarly emphasis. Recognition as a teaching scholar will require accomplishments in teaching and pedagogy well beyond those expected of most other faculty members. Compelling evidence should be provided that the work is authoritative and has had a major influence on the teaching of veterinary medicine. Outstanding activities regarding the scholarship of teaching with subsequent publication of manuscripts related to development, implementation and outcome assessment of innovative instructional technologies and teaching methods/materials in peer-reviewed education journals will be recognized as valued contributions. Accomplishments in the scholarship of teaching can be an important consideration in decisions on merit salary increases and on tenure and promotion for faculty who choose to emphasize this area.

ii. Research

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:
• Developed a focused research program that is nationally recognized by peers and demonstrates a consistent effort to advance a given field or discipline, usually through a
continuous and connected series of studies. The following attributes of the candidate’s body of original work are considered:

- Original hypothesis-driven research. Publications reviewing previous studies are less desirable.
- Quality of the work, impact of the work on the research field or clinical discipline, and quantity of work.
- Rigor of the peer review process and degree of dissemination of publications. Journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research and original works more than edited works.

- Demonstrated ethical conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program (such as those of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee) and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows and collaborators.

A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding are highly regarded. Competitive peer-reviewed extramural awards are weighted most heavily. The candidate should make regular attempts to obtain extra- and intramural funding as a principal investigator. The expectation for number of grants submitted is proportional to the distribution of effort toward research, as established in the faculty member’s letter of offer and/or modified by the chair in an annual review letter. Applications for competitive funds, corporate monies, or private sponsorship are all appropriate. Grants should be in the area of research focus of the candidate, of high quality and involve research with the potential to advance the field or discipline. Success in grantsmanship is considered favorably in the promotion and tenure process and is expected for faculty members with research-intensive appointments. The record of publications should demonstrate successful completion of these funded projects. Research funding is a means to an end; failure to complete research or disseminate findings in a timely manner reduces research productivity rather than enhances it, and thus devalues the effort.

The department encourages collaborative research both intramurally and among other departments/units in this or other universities, as well as interdisciplinary research in which the candidate provides unique expertise to a research team. The department recognizes the importance of co-investigators on grant submissions. The candidate’s intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly, fairly and accurately described to permit assessment of the faculty member’s contribution.

d. Administrative Service

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department in a collegial manner that facilitates positive contributions by others and advancement of the department.
- Demonstrated the potential for meaningful contributions to the profession and continued engagement in administrative service at the department, VMC, college or university levels.

The department evaluates the quality and quantity of effort in administrative service in the context of the faculty member’s overall distribution of effort. Membership in a committee at the department, VMC, college or university level is expected. Active participation and contribution to committees, task forces or other activities are important, including meeting obligations, responsibilities and timelines, rather than just being a member of such groups. Heavy administrative commitments are inappropriate for probationary tenure track faculty and are discouraged by the department. Probationary faculty should seek guidance from their service head, mentoring committee and department chair before accepting administrative/service commitments.
13. Promotion to Professor (or Tenure at the Rank of Professor)

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-02.html) establishes 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 [clinical practice and outreach]; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in [administrative] service.

* Material in square brackets above added to reflect the department's mission.

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 emphasis 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.

The university recognizes “...that (a) all faculty members will not all be able to contribute excellence in all evaluation dimensions and (b) there is a multifaceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of faculty collectively.” (Provost Alutto, Principles for Faculty Reward Systems in a High Performance Academic Culture, Memorandum, March 12, 2009, Department Chairs'/School Directors' Meeting) and “True impact can be made—and made profoundly—in all three areas of our professional commitment: scholarship, teaching and service.” (Provost Alutto, Promotion to Professor: The Need for More Flexible Standards, Key Notes from the Office of Academic Affairs, winter 2010 Issue), http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/keynotes/keynotes_wi10.pdf. “The awarding of the status of Professor should be available not only to those faculty members who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship, but to those who have made visible and demonstrably outstanding contribution to the teaching and service missions of The Ohio State University” (Provost Alutto, The Road Ahead, Address to the University Senate, February 11, 2010). Thus, there is more than one path to promotion to Professor.

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for junior faculty, for students, house officers/graduate students and for members of the profession in general. Evaluation for promotion takes place in the context of the faculty member’s specific assigned duties, as documented in annual review letters provided by the department chair, and the candidate should make a substantial contribution in these areas. Promotion to Professor recognizes a record of sustained meritorious accomplishments, and is not based on seniority alone. The department chair will help Associate Professors assess their strengths and together they will jointly determine how and where the faculty member’s talents can be best employed in order to support and balance the overall mission of the department, VMC, and college. The job description may encompass aspects of more than one of the following areas of focus, and may not require that all criteria from any one focus area be met.

a. Teaching

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to have accomplished some or all of the following:

- Provided an active program for and an environment conducive to the academic development of graduate students and young faculty members. Successful mentoring of
young scientists, other educators, and clinicians is important to support the mission of the department and is expected for promotion to Professor.

- Impact Indicators
  - Trained residents who have demonstrably contributed to their chosen fields, assumed positions of responsibility in the profession and have therefore contributed to the national and international reputation of their mentors and The Ohio State University.
  - Contributed to the training of graduate students whose work has had impact on and made a difference to the profession.
  - Have mentored other faculty members, contributing to their academic productivity and career advancement.

- Active engagement in the teaching curriculum:
  - Impact Indicators
    - Taught a substantial number of lectures and laboratories annually in the professional and/or graduate curriculum.
    - Served as a Team Leader in one or more core courses, providing leadership that advances the quality of the course and the curriculum.
    - Provided excellent teaching in the clinical setting, and is a positive role model for students, interns and residents in clinics.
    - Developed unique innovative teaching tools such as:
      - Templates for course materials such as syllabi.
      - Illustrations, videos and demonstrations that clarify material and engage students in active learning.
      - E-learning and digital media experiences that engage students and stimulate deeper learning.
    - Contributed to and participated in courses on teaching.
    - Won or nominated for teaching awards.

- A documented record of effective didactic and clinical teaching composed of evaluations of both clinical and classroom teaching. These evaluations are in addition to those obtained during the probationary period.
- Teaching portfolio demonstrates the depth and breadth of teaching materials developed by the faculty member, as well as describes innovative teaching techniques and documented reflection and growth as an educator.
- Served on the Departmental Professional Education Committee, Post-Professional Education Committee, college Curriculum Committee, Council on Education, and/or college Elective Committee.
- Written an authoritative widely accepted textbook(s), book chapters in such texts and/or published peer-reviewed papers that contribute to the scholarship of teaching
- Recognized nationally and internationally as an authority in their field
  - Indicators of impact
    - Contributions to continuing education at local, state, regional, national and international events known for their high quality, for example: specialty meetings such as the ACVIM Forum or the ACVS Symposium.
    - Invitations to teach in other academic programs.

b. Scholarship

  i. Publications
For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to have accomplished some or all of the following:

- Published a connected series of first author, first co-author, or senior author manuscripts reflecting a cohesive approach to related questions relevant to the investigator's research focus or clinical specialty. The dossier should demonstrate that the faculty member’s leadership is the motivating force behind the body of work.

- Unequivocal evidence of sustained, focused, high quality scholarly activity in the form of publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Journals whose emphasis is predominantly or exclusively continuing education for practicing veterinarians or the general public are usually not acceptable. Some but not the majority of these publications may be review articles.

- Authored or edited an authoritative textbook (distributed nationally and/or internationally) in the candidate's area of expertise. The candidate who chooses to author an authoritative text will also be expected to produce some first, first co-author or senior author peer-reviewed manuscripts; however, proportionally fewer of these publications may be acceptable than for a candidate who has not authored a definitive textbook.

- Served as an author on collaborative publications (second author or greater) in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals.

Other scholarly publications such as textbook chapters and proceedings are of secondary importance and should not be the scholarly focus of the candidate.

ii. Research

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to have accomplished some or all of the following:

- Established a national and international reputation as an expert in her/his field.

- Made consistent efforts to obtain intramural or extramural funding in a focused area.

- Obtained extramurally and intramurally funded grants as a principal investigator. The record of publications should demonstrate successful completion of these funded projects. Both the total body of work and evidence of sustained research activity are desirable.

- Must have served as primary adviser for a graduate student(s) who has/have completed his/her graduate program(s) (MS or PhD), and have participated as a member of graduate committees. Faculty members with “P” status should have a record of serving as the graduate school representative at dissertation defense examinations.

c. Clinical Practice

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to have accomplished some or all of the following:

- Demonstrated excellent clinical skills and commitment to clinical medicine.
  - Indicators of Impact
    - Documentation from referring veterinarians of excellence of service that fosters case referrals.
    - External peer assessments of clinical abilities and reputation.
    - Input from the director of the VMC.

- Demonstrated leadership in supporting the mission of VMC with excellent service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio.
  - Indicators of Impact
    - Documentation from referring veterinarians.
    - Documentation from clients.
- Number of consultations performed annually by phone or email.
- Demonstrated the ability to manage all duties that are essential for the efficient function of the VMC. The input of the director of the VMC on these issues will be solicited.
- Be recognized locally, nationally and internationally for excellent clinical skills.
  - Indicators of Impact
    - Documentation of requests for consultations from veterinarians elsewhere in the USA and/or abroad.
    - Invited speaking engagements.
    - Authored textbook chapters.

D. Administrative Service

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to have accomplished some or all of the following:
- Served in a prominent administrative role in the department, VMC and/or college and thereby contributed substantially to the academic and/or clinical programs.
- Demonstrated leadership in service roles, both within and external to the university.
  - Indicators of impact
    - Service to professional societies.
    - Public service.

For promotion to Assistant Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:
- Demonstrated excellence in clinical teaching; clinical teaching is at the core of the mission for clinical track faculty in the department. Expectations for teaching and curriculum development are the same as for tenure track faculty members.
- A maximum of 38 weeks may be devoted to clinical teaching (concurrent with patient care) in service areas where there are 3 faculty members, and 39 weeks in services where there are only 2 faculty members. The chair may alter this distribution of effort for an individual faculty member when this alteration serves the mission of the department.

For promotion to Assistant Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to:
- Demonstrate clinical competence. Responsibilities for clinical patient care are qualitatively the same for clinical track and tenure track faculty.
- Supported the mission of VMC with service to referring veterinarians and clients, and outreach to the state of Ohio.
- Demonstrated the ability to manage all duties that are essential for the efficient function of the VMC. The input of the director of the VMC on these issues will be solicited.

Not required for clinical track faculty at the Instructor level.
d. Scholarly Activity

Not required for clinical track faculty at the Instructor level. Faculty members are encouraged to contribute via case reports, book chapters, and papers in proceedings. Participate in collaborative research, design of clinical trials or prospective case studies as time permits and within the context of the faculty member’s assigned distribution of effort.

15. Promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical

For promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective and contemporary clinical patient care; must have a documented high level of competence in and commitment to professional clinical practice including consultation and outreach to the animal-owning public, private veterinarians and industry constituents; and must display the potential for the potential for continuing to provide high quality teaching and clinical patient care relevant to the mission of the department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to Associate Professor-clinical are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure in the context of the clinical track faculty member’s assigned distribution of effort. In addition, the candidate must have attained board certification in an appropriate clinical specialty (if available). An Assistant Professor-Clinical should develop a reputation as an expert among peers both locally and regionally. An Assistant Professor-Clinical is encouraged to write case reports, book chapters, or participate in collaborative research, the design of clinical trials or prospective studies or participate in and publish scholarship of teaching articles as time permits and within the context of and proportional to the faculty member’s assigned distribution of effort.

A faculty member may choose to remain at the rank of Associate Professor-Clinical indefinitely; however, this would not be consistent with the goals of the department, college or university regarding career advancement of faculty.

a. Teaching

Expectations are similar to those for Assistant Professors in the tenure track. **For promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:**

- Progressively increased his/her teaching in the classroom or laboratory instruction in the professional and/or graduate student curriculum. Faculty members may be expected to assume the role of teaching team leader.
- Participated in clinical teaching, for a maximum of 38 to 39 weeks annually. The Chair may alter this distribution of effort for an individual faculty member if this alteration serves the mission of the Department.
- Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in lectures and clinical teaching and demonstrated continuing growth in knowledge of subject matter.
- 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. For example, the department encourages the use of Turning Point response devices and Carmen-based problem solving exercises.
- Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity and appreciation of discovery of new knowledge.
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process.
- Treated students with respect and courtesy.
• Improved the curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs.
• Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.
• A documented record of effective teaching that includes student and peer evaluations of clinical and didactic teaching.
• Contributed on a regular basis to clinical training of house-officers and to departmental graduate-resident courses, seminars, rounds, journal clubs and conferences.
• Actively served on committees of Masters-level graduate students when appropriate; however, this is not a required activity for clinical track faculty.
• Effectively mentored professional students and house-officers.
• Participated in educational outreach activities for the animal-owning public, private practitioners and industry constituents.

The department recognizes education outside of the university as an important part of its mission. Clinical track faculty members may support the mission of the VMC by developing outreach programs for veterinarians in Ohio and beyond and for other persons in Ohio with interests in companion animals, farm animals, horses and animal-related agriculture. This activity is encouraged for Associate Professors-Clinical. Outreach activities should not be so numerous as to compromise the overall effectiveness of the faculty member's performance in primary responsibilities or have a negative impact on the respective service or faculty colleagues.

b. Clinical Practice

For promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:
• Demonstrated clinical competence and commitment. Responsibilities for clinical patient care are qualitatively the same for clinical track and tenure track faculty.
• Supported the mission of VMC with service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio.
• Demonstrated the ability to manage all duties that are essential for the efficient function of the VMC. The input of the director of the VMC on these issues will be solicited.

c. Administrative Service

For promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:
• Served on and contributed meaningfully to a departmental, VMC or college committee or committees.
• Engaged in public relations efforts that enhance the image and visibility of his/her service, department, VMC or college.

d. Scholarly Activity

i. Publications

For promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:
• Published in professional journals (peer-reviewed journals are desirable but not required). Publications may include results of research (applied or basic), original observations, experiences (e.g., case reports and retrospective studies), manuscripts in lay journals, solutions to clinical problems, book chapters, or educational materials.

ii. Research

For promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have
• Participated in original or collaborative research as time permits and in the context of his/her
distribution of effort. Research efforts that may be accessible to clinical track faculty may
include, but are not limited to, prospective clinical trials, investigation and development of
new drugs/devices and new uses of existing drugs/devices, and studies of new surgical
techniques or diagnostic methods.

16. Promotion to Professor-Clinical

For promotion to Professor-Clinical, a faculty member must have a record of continuing
professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of
excellence in clinical teaching and patient care; leadership in administrative service to the
Department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials
pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. A Professor-Clinical should develop a
reputation among peers as an expert both nationally and internationally. Promotion to the rank
of Professor-Clinical is in recognition of outstanding accomplishments in a given field/discipline.

   a. Teaching

For promotion to Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:

• Been actively engaged in the teaching curriculum by giving a substantial number of lectures
and teaching in laboratories annually in the professional and/or graduate curricula.
Requirements for teaching are similar to those for promotion to Professor (tenure track).
Faculty members are expected to assume the role of teaching team leader.
• Participated in clinical teaching for a maximum of 38 to 39 weeks annually. The chair may
alter this distribution of effort for an individual faculty member when such a change serves
the mission of the department.
• Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in lectures and clinical teaching and
demonstrated continuing growth in knowledge of subject matter.
• 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. For example, the
department encourages the use of Turning Point audience response devices and Carmen-
based problem solving exercises.
• Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought,
creativity and appreciation of discovery of new knowledge.
• Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process.
• Treated students with respect and courtesy.
• Improved the curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic
programs.
• Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.
• A documented record of effective teaching composed of student and formative peer
evaluations of lecture, laboratory and clinical teaching. These evaluations must have
occurred after promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical.
• Contributed substantially and regularly to the clinical training and mentoring of house
officers and to departmental graduate-resident courses, seminars, rounds, journal clubs and
conferences.
• Actively served on committees of Masters-level graduate students when appropriate;
however, this is not a required activity for clinical track faculty.
• Effectively mentored professional students and house officers.
• Participated in educational outreach activities for the animal-owning public, private
practitioners and industry constituents.

   b. Clinical Practice
For promotion to Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Demonstrated clinical competence and commitment. Responsibilities for clinical patient care are qualitatively the same for clinical track and tenure track faculty.
- Assumed a leadership role in supporting the mission of the VMC with exceptional service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio.
- Demonstrated the ability to manage all duties that are essential for the efficient function of the VMC. The input of the director of the VMC on these issues will be solicited.

  c. Administrative Service

For promotion to Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Served on and contributed meaningfully to departmental, VMC, college or university committees.
- Assumed a leadership role in departmental activities (e.g., service head).
- Engaged in public relations efforts that enhance the image and visibility of his/her service, department, VMC or college.

  d. Scholarship

For promotion to Professor-Clinical, a faculty member is expected to have:

  i. Publications

- Published additional manuscripts beyond those described for promotion to Associate Professor-Clinical. Peer-reviewed publications are desirable but not required.

  ii. Research

- Clinical track faculty members are expected to participate in original or collaborative research as time permits and in accordance with their distribution of effort. Research efforts that may be accessible to clinical track faculty may include, but are not limited to prospective clinical trials, investigation and development of new drugs and new uses of existing drugs, and studies of new surgical techniques or diagnostic methods. Clinical track faculty members are expected to achieve national recognition in their discipline through presentation at and participation in continuing education for practicing veterinarians, scientific meetings and other outreach activities.

17. Regular Faculty with Joint or Adjunct Appointments

Faculty with joint or adjunct appointments will undergo review for promotion, promotion and tenure, or reappointment. The review will follow the same procedures as for regular clinical track or tenure track faculty in the department, whichever is appropriate for the joint or adjunct faculty member. If the candidate's primary appointment is in another TIU, the Appointment Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the primary TIU are followed.

B. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Reviews

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-04.html) and the Office Academic Affairs’ annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Book 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (http://www.oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html), Book 3.
The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all regular faculty members in the department.

1. Candidate Responsibilities

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines that can be found in Book 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (http://www.oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html). All regular faculty members (tenure and clinical track) must submit their dossiers in Research in View (formerly OSU:pro). It is the candidate’s responsibility to maintain all documentation relative to teaching, clinical practice, research, outreach and administrative service referenced in the dossier. The dossier, excluding external letters of evaluation, must be in the department chair’s office by September 15th in the year of the review. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the OAA core dossier outline, including but not limited to those highlighted on the Checklist. Dossiers of faculty approved for promotion and/or tenure in the preceding year are available for review (excluding letters of evaluation) in the department office and can be useful to candidates for promotion and tenure as models for the development of their own dossiers. *Please note that requirements for dossier preparation vary annually and the OAA updates the guidelines yearly. (Faculty members should consult the updated version before submitting their dossiers, and should not assume that reference dossiers from previous years are in the most up-to-date format).
- To submit a Teaching Portfolio.
- To submit a copy of the first page of each peer-reviewed publication listed in the dossier. This page should show the authors, the title and the citation reference for the manuscript (proof of publication). The faculty member should annotate each page with one of the one of the following labels: First Author, Co-First Author, or Senior Author, if appropriate.
- To submit a summary table of all didactic (lecture/laboratory) teaching (see Appendix B). This table should include the number of hours of laboratory or lecture instruction for every course (core and elective professional and graduate-level courses) in which the faculty member participated and should indicate for which course(s) the faculty member was team leader. The relevant time period for the documentation is 5 years or since last promotion, whichever is the shortest time.
- To submit a summary table of publications (see Appendix C).
- To submit a summary table of all funded grants (see Appendix D).
- If external evaluations are required, to review, upon request by the department chair or the chair of the DPTS, the list of potential external evaluators developed by the chair and the DPTS. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The chair decides whether removal is justified.
- Faculty seeking promotion will select the three best examples of their publications for external review. These publications may include, but are not limited to, peer-reviewed publications, book chapters, and proceedings notes. Faculty are asked to provide a concise summary describing briefly why he/she selected each publication (2-4 sentences for each publication) as a representation of his/her scholarly works. This summary accompanies the selected publications for review by external evaluators. This allows the external evaluators to assess the broad range of academic/scholarly contributions conducted in the department. Peer-reviewed publications are preferred for tenure track faculty. Evaluators are asked to comment on the impact of the faculty member's teaching, clinical practice and scholarship (tenure track primarily) on the clinical specialty and the profession as a whole. For tenure track and clinical track faculty, peer review should include a specific, detailed assessment of the effect the
faculty member’s scholarship/discovery has had on the diagnosis, treatment and general understanding of animal or human diseases. In other words, the question that should be asked is: “How has this new information changed the way veterinary medicine is practiced, or how has it impacted the veterinary profession as a whole?” For clinical track faculty, peer review should assess the quality of the contribution of the faculty member to the practice and teaching of veterinary medicine.

- To inform the chair in writing by March 1 if the candidate wishes to be considered or initiate a non-mandatory promotion and/or tenure review.
- Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing (in writing) the chair. If the review process has moved beyond the department, the chair shall inform the dean or the provost, as required.

2. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (DPTS) Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the DPTS are as follows:

- To review this document regularly and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty. The document should be thoroughly reviewed and revised as necessary following appointment or reappointment of the department chair.
- To assist the chair in gathering evidence of the quality and effectiveness of the candidate’s 1) teaching, 2) scholarship, and 3) clinical practice from students and peers, as appropriate. The DPTS will gather evidence for all faculty members (including those with joint appointments in other departments) with assigned duties in this department.
- Annually, in Summer and Autumn Semesters, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below:
  - Late spring: Select from among its members a Procedural Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedural Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedural Oversight Designee’s responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
  - Late spring: Suggest names of external evaluators to the chair and then review the names with each candidate. This process should be completed before July 1 so that the chair can contact potential external reviewers to determine their willingness to provide letters by September 1.
  - Autumn: Review candidates’ dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations) and consistency with the requirements of the Office of Academic Affairs; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before dossiers are posted on the VCS Temp Drive for review by the eligible faculty, usually during the first week of October.
  - A member of the DPTS (The “Dossier Coach”) will meet with each candidate for clarification of recommended alterations of the dossier and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. (This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate’s record.)
  - Draft an analysis of the candidate’s performance in teaching, clinical practice, research, outreach and administrative service to discuss at a meeting of the DPTS during which the committee will clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. This analysis should be factual rather than evaluative. The summary of the candidate’s dossier is presented by the dossier coach at the COEF. The DPTS neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the dossier. The DPTS will not make a recommendation regarding the outcome of the review; this is the sole purview of the COEF.
  - Summarize the deliberations at the meeting of the COEF to include the faculty vote and a faculty perspectives expressed (strengths and weaknesses of the candidates) during the meeting.
When the opinions of the eligible faculty differ markedly from those of external reviewers, such differences should be addressed in the letter to the chair.

All members of the DPTS are asked to review and sign the report before it is submitted to the chair. The committee's report and results of the faculty vote become part of the candidate's dossier for subsequent levels of review.

All members of the DPTS are asked to review and sign this letter before it is submitted to the chair. The committee's letter and results of the faculty vote become part of the candidate's dossier for subsequent levels of review.

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the COEF, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- During the meeting of the eligible faculty, set the date for the meeting the following year. This meeting usually occurs on the 2nd to 4th Wednesday in October.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

To consider annually, in the Spring Semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to give the chair an opinion as to whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Requests of this nature should occur prior to March 1. Results of this vote will be reported to the chair who in consultation with the DPTS will advise the faculty member regarding the decision to initiate a formal review.

- The DPTS bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's dossier and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (e.g., student and evaluations of teaching and teaching portfolio). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member who requests and is denied a promotion review must be granted the review the next time s/he requests it, per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-04.html). If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A probationary faculty member's request for a non-mandatory review may be denied in consecutive years during the probationary period.
- A decision by the DPTS and the chair to permit a review to take place in no way commits the DPTS, the chair, or any other party involved in the review process, to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a US citizen or permanent resident (has a “green card”). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

To follow the chair’s directives with respect to conflict of interest and voting on issues pertaining to appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or hiring of new faculty. A faculty member with a question on conflict of interest should approach the chair who will inform the chair of the DPTS whether or not the faculty member should vote.
3. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities (eligible faculty—COEF)

The responsibilities of the members of the COEF are as follows:

- To thoroughly and objectively review every candidate's dossier and teaching portfolio in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all COEF meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in the discussion of every case; and to vote.
- To vote by paper ballot either “for” or “against” reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. Faculty members may also abstain from voting; an abstention is not considered a vote. Only those in attendance for discussion of the candidate’s record may participate in the vote. The quorum for this and other issues requiring a vote is a simple majority of eligible faculty. Two-thirds of the voting eligible faculty must vote positively for the faculty report to carry a positive recommendation for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion of the candidate.
- To recuse himself/herself from the discussion and voting should a conflict of interest exist.

4. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure may not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are not considered for promotion by this department.
- To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the DPTS, the chair and the candidate.
- To assign someone other than the candidate to summarize open ended student comments submitted along with other student evaluations of teaching.
- To make electronic copies of the following documents for each candidate for review by the COEF at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted on
  - Final version of the dossier.
  - Teaching portfolio.
  - SEIs (provided by the candidate or Educational Design and Systems).
  - Summaries of student open ended comments as prepared by the Office of Educational Design and Systems.
  - Annual Review Letters for each year for the last 5 years since date of hire or last promotion/reappointment.
  - Letters from external reviewers suitably redacted if so directed by the chair.
  - Clarification/rebuttal letters, if submitted by the candidate, the chair of the DPTS, or the chair.
- To remove any member of the COEF from the review of a candidate when the committee member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review process.
- To attend the meetings of the COEF at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised by faculty during the meetings.
- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the COEF’s completed evaluation and recommendations.
- To meet with the COEF to explain any recommendation contrary to the recommendation of the Committee.
• To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the departmental review process:
  o Of the recommendations by the COEF and the chair.
  o That the written evaluations by the COEF and the chair are available for review.
  o In writing of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days of receipt of the letter from the chair. These comments outlined in a letter of clarification/rebuttal will be included in the dossier. The chair should supply the candidate with a form letter (APPENDIX H) to sign and return indicating that she/he will/will not submit a rebuttal letter.
• To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier. One iteration of comments at the department level review is permitted.
• To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office’s deadline, except in the case of auxiliary faculty for whom the chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the chair is final in such cases.
• To receive the letter from the COEF on candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the chair of the other TIU by the date requested.

5. External Evaluations

External evaluations of research, scholarly activity and professional reputation are required for all promotion reviews, including all tenure track tenure and promotion reviews and all clinical track promotion reviews. External evaluators are instructed to evaluate the quality and quantity of scholarship in context to the assigned distribution of effort.

Letters of external evaluation should meet the criteria described below.

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 teaching and clinical skills, research and scholarly productivity and other relevant performance, and who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. No conflict of interest should exist between the evaluator and the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments and affiliation at a peer academic or scientific research institution. External evaluators should be of higher academic rank than the candidate. In some circumstances when sufficient reviewers meeting this criterion are not available in the discipline, an evaluator of the same rank may be considered acceptable by the DPTS chair and department chair.
• Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will usefulness be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and/or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and letters are solicited early enough that additional letters may be requested should fewer than five letters result from the first round of requests. As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the DPTS, the chair and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-04.html) requires that persons selected by the candidate write no more than one-half the external evaluation letters in
the dossier. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs’ suggested format, provided at http://www.oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier. If concerns arise about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the department's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice. Both a list of the individuals from who letters were requested and all letters received become part of the dossier. Only external letters of evaluation requested by this procedure will be included in the dossier.

6. Documentation for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs’ dossier outline. While the DPTS makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are completed by the candidate. The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted below (with the exception of the teaching portfolio), is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of scholarship and service noted in the following two bullet points is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

- Results of a PubMed search or photocopies of the title page of every peer-reviewed or peer-edited manuscript to document publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
- Faculty members should NOT solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review with the exception of persons who are performing formative reviews of teaching.

  a. Teaching

  i. Lectures and Laboratories

Undergraduate, graduate and professional courses taught since the date of hire, last promotion or for the last 5 years (whichever is more recent), should be listed in the dossier in the recommended Office of Academic Affairs dossier format. Extension, continuing education, or other non-credit courses should not be included here. For purposes of departmental review, in this table the candidate should include hours of teaching (lecture and laboratory) for each course or provide an additional table summarizing teaching (Appendix B), that details the hours of lecture and laboratory instruction. This requirement is necessary because most courses in our college are team taught, and it is difficult to determine from a percentage of effort the actual number of hours of contact time.

  ii. Clinical Teaching
Clinical teaching in the department includes, but is not limited to, supervised patient work-up and management, rounds and seminars. Rounds are defined as formal discussion of cases assigned to a student on a particular service. Clinical teaching (during formal clinical rotations, e.g. Small Animal Medicine) should be listed in the dossier teaching summary table by semester (autumn, spring, Maymester, and summer). The dossier text should contain a description of the number of weeks per year on clinical service, hours per week of contact time with students during supervised patient work-up and management, estimated numbers of students taught per week and hours per week spent in rounds and seminars. Teaching on Saturday, Sunday or holidays should be described.

iii. House Officer/Graduate Student Teaching

Graduate student programs and teaching should be listed in the recommended Office of Academic Affairs dossier format. Noteworthy accomplishments of graduate students for whom the faculty member has been the adviser of record should be described in the dossier (e.g., publications during or emanating from graduate programs, awards for graduate work, board certification, awards for research abstracts and posters, prestigious post-docs or first post-graduate positions).

iv. Curriculum Development

The dossier should describe the design and implementation of new or revised courses, and the development and outcomes assessment of innovative instructional technologies and new teaching methods or materials in the recommended Office of Academic Affairs dossier format.

v. Continuing Education Instruction

The dossier should also list in a table in chronological order, all international, national, regional, state and local veterinary meetings at which the faculty member gave a continuing education lecture. For ease of reading and to maximize impact of this material, use one entry per meeting. Note the number of hours of lecture or laboratory instruction and the number of attendees at each meeting. Presentation of an abstract at a scientific meeting should be listed in only one location in the dossier, preferably, as a scientific publication, not as a continuing education presentation.

vi. Scholarship of Teaching

All articles in journals, book chapters and proceedings that pertain to the scholarship of teaching should be listed in the dossier with a description of the extent to which pedagogical materials developed by the candidate have been adopted by other faculty here and/or at other institutions. Also, the extent to which the candidate is invited outside of The Ohio State University to provide expertise on teaching should be described when appropriate.

vii. Teaching Portfolio

Faculty members are required by the department to develop and maintain a comprehensive teaching portfolio. Information, resources and guidelines regarding teaching portfolios are available at http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching_portfolio/teaching_port.html and other resources posted in the Faculty Resources folder on the department’s shared drive.

viii. Teaching Evaluations

For the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, the candidate shall submit as a part of his/her dossier:
• Cumulative instructor evaluations completed by professional students and prepared by the College of Veterinary Medicine Office of Educational Design and Systems (EDS) (see Appendix E). Student evaluations may include overall course evaluations (see Appendix E), if the faculty member was the course team leader. Persons who may evaluate the candidate’s teaching include: professional (DVM) students, post-DVM clinical trainees (interns, residents), graduate students, post-doctoral trainees and graduate veterinarians involved in continuing education programs.

• Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught to undergraduate non-professional students.

• Self-reflective comments regarding the formative peer reviews of teaching provided by the members of the candidates mentoring committee or other faculty members should be included in the teaching portfolio. Formative peer reviews are for the candidate’s information and growth, and are therefore not included in the dossier or Teaching Portfolio. See Appendix F for a description of the peer review process in this department.

Peer evaluations may include observations and assessments of classroom or laboratory instruction and clinical teaching using standard evaluation instruments. Peer evaluation can include evaluation of teaching in large group presentations (lectures), small group presentations (e.g., rounds and seminars), laboratories and unstructured teaching (e.g., individual teaching). Peer evaluations can also include review of contributions to curriculum and of course materials, such as syllabi, exams, lecture notes, study questions, case problems, audiovisual media, electronic media, interactive media and other instructional materials of all types.

• Other relevant documentation that may be used to indicate the quality of teaching as appropriate.

Indicators of excellence in teaching may include, but are not limited to:

• Outstanding evaluations of teaching effectiveness.
• Development and publication of innovative teaching methods and materials, e.g., case reports, textbooks, or autotutorial materials.
• Development, implementation and adoption of new instructional technologies, methods, materials and/or programs.
• Being the chair or committee member of successful Master’s thesis and Doctoral dissertation committees.
• Advisor of successful resident candidates for specialty board certification.
• Selection for university, college, or professional association outstanding teacher awards.
• Evidence that the faculty member is highly sought after as an invited speaker.

Indicators of excellence in the scholarship of teaching may include, but are not limited to:

• Publication in leading peer-reviewed journals.
• Citation Index listing of teaching research publications.
• Funded intra- or extramural research support for study of issues relevant to teaching.
• Recognition of contributions to the advancement of teaching, such as presentations at national or international conferences, invitations to serve as a consultant on teaching issues.
• Faculty appointment in other departments that have a strong program in the chosen area of teaching scholarship.
• Recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards.
b. Scholarship

In the review process, attention is paid both to the candidate’s productivity since the date of hire (or last promotion if more recent) and to the candidate’s accomplishments over her/his entire career. Dates must be provided in the candidate’s dossier for all scholarly activities and professional accomplishments.

i. Publications

Quality indicators of scholarly publications include ratings from citation indices (showing how often and how quickly the candidate’s work has been cited) and indicators of journal quality (readership, journal ranking, reputation, impact on the field, acceptance rates, etc.). Inherent in evaluation of the candidate is determining the effect of his or her work on the field of clinical veterinary medicine.

ii. Research

Indicators of the quality of a research program may include documentation of success in attracting external funds, awards and other recognitions, invited scientific lectures, participation in and/or organization of panels and symposia at professional meetings, impact on policy and extension programs, consulting assignments (including reviews of other departments and organizations) and development of computer software.

For the time period since the last promotion, the candidate should supply:

- Copies of the title page(s) of all published scholarly papers to document the citation (proof of publication and authorship). 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 or accepted with minor revision required.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received. Table of grants and contracts obtained (See Appendix D).
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (e.g. published reviews including publications where one’s work is favorably cited, or grants and contract proposals that have been submitted but are pending).
- Lists of prizes and awards for research and other scholarship.

c. Clinical Practice

Specific clinical responsibilities with dates of service should be described in the dossier. Evaluation of clinical service can be based on peer evaluations, results of questionnaires or customer satisfaction surveys sent to clients and veterinarians and assessment by the Veterinary Medical Center Director. The following can be used to quantify service: the number of hours per week devoted to patient care, number of weekly oral or e-mail communications with clients, number of oral and written communications with referring veterinarians and the number of telephone calls and hours/week devoted to conversations with owners and veterinary groups. Promotional articles, interviews and brochures produced can be used to quantify service activity for the VMC.
d. Administrative Service

Administrative duties and accomplishments since the last promotion should be included in the dossier. Administrative and committee service should be listed in the dossier by category (department, VMC, college or university) with dates, description of responsibility and quantification of effort (e.g., hours per year). The candidate should note for which committees s/he was the chair. Note awards for administrative service. Include any available documentation (e.g., letters from committee chair) of the quality of administrative work that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

e. External Professional Service and Outreach

The department values service to professional organizations, associations, specialty colleges and societies. The department encourages service as a member of an editorial board, professional panel, program organizer, grant reviewer, or reviewer of manuscripts for high quality journals. Use of professional expertise in community service, and industry outreach and support is also encouraged. In general, external professional service should be modest for probationary faculty members. Commitment to external service should always be appropriately balanced with time needed for responsibilities within the College of Veterinary Medicine.

Outreach and engagement are defined as mutually beneficial, scholarly collaboration with outside entities such as the public, business, professional organizations, government, education and social services. It includes those aspects of RESEARCH that makes what we discover useful, of TEACHING that enables learning and of SERVICE that benefit the world outside of The Ohio State University. Service to other professional or industry organizations cultivates relationships and partnership that are often beneficial to the department, VMC, and college. Continuing education at the local, state, regional, national and international levels are important in disseminating new knowledge and technology, in advancing veterinary medicine and in benefitting the profession, the community and society.

VIII. Appeals


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 involved in the review process to follow written policies and procedures (“due process”).

IX. Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-05.html) 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

Overview of College’s Teaching Evaluation Program: The College requires standardized evaluation of all courses in the professional curriculum. The course evaluation instruments must be approved by the College. Each semester, faculty members must request that the Office of
Educational Systems and Design (EDS) place them on a list to receive student evaluations of teaching. A comprehensive student evaluation system is administered by EDS, which is comprised of staff who report to the Associate Dean of Student Affairs and the Dean of Academic Affairs. The EDS conducts student evaluations of every core and elective course in the professional curriculum under a mandate from the college’s Council on Education (COE), which is comprised of the faculty team leaders of all college core courses. Course evaluations are administered electronically, on the university’s web-based teaching platform, Carmen. Some faculty members elect to offer students one bonus point in the course for completing the on-line evaluations.

Faculty members receive results of their student evaluations each semester (for students in years 1-3) and each trimester for 4th year students. Team leaders receive student evaluations for their courses on the same schedule. The department chair also receives copies of these evaluations; the DPTS reviews these documents as part of dossier assessment, and the professors in the department review teaching evaluations for all Associate Professors annually. A summary of results of all core course evaluations are presented at regular meetings of the COE.

B. Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Please see Appendix F for the specifics regarding peer evaluation of teaching for faculty in the department.

Peer teaching evaluation is comprehensive and may include, in addition to classroom or clinical visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments and exams. Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course, quality and effectiveness of testing tools and appropriateness of approach relative to current knowledge in the discipline. Consequently the peer assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

Peer reviews are conducted at the request of the faculty member and are considered formative only. The report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. The faculty member reflects on these peer reviews in his/her teaching portfolio.

The peer reviewer completes a form letter (Appendix G) to inform the chair that a formative review has taken place. This letter is included in the dossier, as documentation of having undergone a formative review.

The Office of Educational Design and Systems can, upon request of a faculty member, arrange for alternative methods of evaluation; for example, videotaping of the faculty member while teaching, observation of the faculty member by education specialists and evaluation of the faculty member by a focus group of students. Faculty seeking formative reviews may also seek the services of the office of Faculty and TA Development (see http://ftad.osu.edu).

C. Continuing Education Evaluations

Postgraduate veterinarians attending continuing education lectures and courses may evaluate the candidate’s teaching, providing that a uniform evaluation instrument is used, that the evaluation instrument is administered to all attendees, that someone other than the faculty member collects and analyzes the evaluations, and that the results are conveyed directly to the EDS, the DPTS or the department chair. The department recognizes that evaluations of continuing education are useful, but considers this form of evaluation to be an optional component of the promotion and tenure process. When a small proportion of attendees
complete any evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

XI. Outcome Assessment – National Board Exam Reporting

Comprehensive comparison data are derived from the national board examinations that are taken by all graduating veterinary students in the United States for professional licensing purposes. The performance of our students (mean +/- SD) in each clinical area, specialty and discipline is compared and ranked with national data derived from all veterinary students in the United States. These data can provide a relative measure of the effectiveness of teaching in specialty areas served by a single faculty or small groups (usually 2) of faculty. Tables and graphs of the national data and Ohio State comparisons are made available annually to all faculty members.
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Appendix A

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences
Promotion & Tenure Committee

The processes of promotion, tenure, or reappointment are by definition based on an assessment of the accomplishments of the candidate by each faculty member who makes his/her own individual interpretation of the facts. This assessment is therefore subjective. The university gives strong consideration to the assessment of faculty colleagues and the chair in the candidate's Tenure Initiating Unit. The members of the candidate's department and the chair are his/her peers, and are best able to fairly evaluate performance in the context of the expectations (as defined by the chair) for scholarship, clinical practice, teaching, research, outreach and administrative service that are commensurate with the candidate’s unique contribution to the overall departmental mission and programs. The college Promotion and Tenure Committee and the dean also add their subjective assessments of the candidate to the evaluative process.

This process is designed to be subjective, and it is not possible to provide a ‘road map’ for achieving promotion, tenure, or reappointment. Each candidate brings his/her own perspective to establishing a portfolio of accomplishments in the form of a dossier. Likewise, evaluation of the dossier to determine the worthiness for promotion, tenure, or reappointment is unique to
each faculty member. All have different perspectives and their own ideas of the benchmarks upon which their decisions in this process rest.

Although it is therefore impossible to provide candidates with a comprehensive list of the requirements for promotion, tenure, or reappointment, previous experience suggests that there are some benchmarks of performance that will be achieved by the majority of faculty who are successfully promoted, granted tenure, or reappointed. The following guidelines are offered as a summary of our experiences with successful candidates. Please note that provision of these benchmarks in no way implies that achieving any or all of these goals guarantees success in the evaluative process.

Assistant to Associate Professor

Tenure Track Faculty

The following benchmarks are for a full-time (1.0 FTE) faculty member whose distribution of effort specifies 24-26 weeks of patient care and clinical teaching, 22-24 weeks respectively devoted to scholarly activity, didactic teaching, outreach and administrative service, and 4 weeks of vacation annually. Faculty with differing distributions of effort (reflecting specific career focus) will have proportionally different benchmarks for individual categories.

1) Teaching
   a. Progressive increase in didactic lectures to achieve a minimum of 12+ annual hours of lecture or laboratory instruction in the professional or graduate student curriculum (2 hr lab = 1 hr lecture).
   b. Accepts course Team Leadership as assigned by the chair.
   c. Participates in at least 24-26 weeks of clinical teaching annually, or in the number of weeks specified by the chair.
   d. Average student evaluations of at least 3.5 for classroom and clinical teaching during the probationary period.
   e. Must undergo at least 2 formative peer evaluations per year. The number of evaluations of clinical didactic teaching will reflect the candidate’s responsibilities and will be specified by the chair.

2) Graduate Students
   a. Participated on at least 2 graduate committees during the probationary period.
   b. Actively involved in mentoring graduate students, both those in the candidate’s program as well as other graduate students who might benefit from the candidate’s expertise.

3) Clinical Practice
   a. Annual assessments by peer(s) and/or chair of clinical effectiveness must be supportive.
   b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio, including but not limited to, engaging in good business practices, providing estimates of the cost of care, maintaining complete medical records, communicating conscientiously and effectively with clients and referring veterinarians, and capturing charges. Behaves in a consistently collegial fashion and fosters teamwork and positive working and learning environments.
   c. Supportive input from the director of the VMC.
4) Scholarly Activity
   a. Research
      i. Developed a research focus that is nationally recognized by peers.
      ii. Collaborates with relevant college and university investigators.
   b. Publications
      i. A minimum of 6-10 publications of which a minimum of 3 must be first
         author and an additional 3 must be either first, first co-author (i.e. second
         author behind a graduate student or resident), or senior author
         publications in a focused area in reputable peer-reviewed journals.
      ii. Original studies or case series (i.e. not case reports).
      iii. Chair will specify in annual review letters his/her expectations for
         publications.
   c. Funding
      i. Has obtained competitive intramural or extramural grant or contract
         funding.
      ii. Makes regular attempts to obtain extramural funding.
      iii. Seeks intramural funding to enhance program development.
      iv. Chair will specify in annual review letters his/her expectations.

5) Administrative Service
   a. Active membership and participation on at least 1 departmental or higher level
      committee or the equivalent in administrative service as defined by the chair.
   b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with clinical service and outreach
      to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio.

6) Recognized by peers as an expert, achieved peer recognition regionally and, nationally.

Clinical Track Faculty

The following benchmarks are for a faculty member whose distribution of effort specifies 36
weeks of patient care and clinical teaching, 12 weeks devoted to scholarly activity, didactic
教學, outreach and administrative service, and 4 weeks of vacation annually. Faculty with
differing distributions of effort will have proportionally different benchmarks for individual
categories.

1) Teaching
   a. Progressive increase in didactic lectures to achieve a minimum of 12+ annual
      hours of lecture or laboratory teaching in professional or graduate student
      curriculum.
   b. Accepts course Team Leadership as assigned by the department chair.
   c. Participates in a minimum of 36 weeks of clinical teaching annually that includes
      clinical education and mentoring of professional students and house officers.
   d. Average student evaluations at least 3.5 for classroom and clinical teaching over
      probationary period.
   e. Must undergo at least 2 formative peer evaluations per year. The number of
      evaluations of clinical and didactic teaching will reflect the candidate’s
      responsibilities and will be specified by the department chair.
2) Clinical Practice
   a. Annual evaluations of clinical effectiveness must be supportive.
   b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with service to referring
      veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio, including but not
      limited to, engaging in good business practices, providing estimates of the cost of
      care, maintaining complete medical records, communicating conscientiously and
      effectively with clients and referring veterinarians, and capturing charges.
      Behaves in a consistently collegial fashion and fosters teamwork and positive
      working and learning environments.
   c. Supportive input from the Director of the VMC.

3) Scholarly Activity: Publications
   a. A minimum of 2 publications (peer review not required).
   b. Case series, case reports, book chapters, publications in professional journals.

4) Scholarly Activity: Research
   a. Collaborative scholarly work is required. This could be collaborative research,
      documentation of innovative clinical procedures or instrumentation, other clinical
      discoveries, refinements of surgical techniques, or observations in the broad
      category of the scholarship of teaching.

5) Administrative Service
   a. Active membership and participation on at least 1 departmental or higher level
      committee or the equivalent in administrative service as defined by the chair.
   b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with clinical service and outreach
      to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio.

6) Recognized by peers as an expert, achieved peer recognition locally or regionally.

Research Emphasis Faculty

The following benchmarks are for a faculty member whose distribution of effort specifies
approximately 12-13 weeks of clinical practice, 36-39 weeks devoted to scholarly activity,
didactic teaching, outreach and administrative service, and 4 weeks of vacation annually.
Faculty with differing distributions of effort will have proportionally different benchmarks for
individual categories.

1) Scholarly Activity
   a. Program
      i. Develop a nationally recognized, focused research program.
      ii. Collaboration with relevant college and university programs and
          investigators is expected.
   b. Publications
      i. A minimum of 8-13 publications of which a minimum of 4 must be first
         author and an additional 4 must be either first, first co-author (e.g.,
         second author behind a graduate student or resident), or senior author.
         Publications in a focused area in reputable peer-reviewed journals
ii. Reporting results of original studies focusing on hypothesis-driven research.

   c. Funding
      i. Has obtained extramural grant and/or contract funding.
      ii. Regular attempts to obtain extramural funding, including submissions to agencies that support indirect costs.
      iii. Seeks intramural funds to enhance program development
      iv. Successful grantsmanship; chair to specify numbers in annual review meeting/letter.

2) Graduate Students
   a. Primary advisor for at least 1 PhD student, AND
   b. Participated in at least 2 additional graduate committees.
   c. Expected to be actively involved in mentoring graduate students, both those in the candidate’s program as well as other graduate students who might benefit from the candidate’s expertise.

3) Teaching
   a. Progressive increase in didactic lectures to achieve a minimum of 12+ annual hours of lecture or laboratory teaching in the professional or graduate student curriculum.
   b. Accepts course Team Leadership as assigned by the chair.
   c. Participates in approximately 13 weeks of clinical teaching annually.
   d. Average student evaluations at least 3.5 for classroom and clinical teaching during the probationary period.
   e. Effective clinical educator where appropriate to job description.
   f. Must undergo at least 2 formative peer evaluations per year. The number of evaluations of clinical and didactic teaching will reflect the candidate’s responsibilities and will be specified by the chair.

4) Clinical Practice
   a. Annual evaluations of clinical effectiveness must be supportive.
   b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio, including but not limited to, engaging in good business practices, providing estimates of the cost of care, maintaining complete medical records, communicating conscientiously and effectively with clients and referring veterinarians, and capturing charges. Behaves in a consistently collegial fashion and fosters teamwork and positive working and learning environments.
   c. Supportive input from the Director of the VMC.

5) Administrative Service
   a. Active membership and participation on at least 1 departmental or higher level committee or the equivalent in administrative service as defined by the chair
   b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with clinical service and outreach to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio.
6) Recognized by peers as an expert, achieved peer recognition regionally and nationally.

**Associate to Full Professor**

**Tenure Track Faculty**

The University recognizes that there are multiple pathways to promotion to Full Professor. The focus area(s) selected by each associate professor will reflect his/her areas of primary interest and expertise among the various possible contributions to teaching, research, clinical practice, administrative service and outreach missions of the Department. Each faculty member will consult with the chair to align the faculty member’s career focus with the overall departmental needs and mission.

The following benchmarks are for a faculty member whose distribution of effort specifies 24-26 weeks of clinical practice and teaching, 22-24 weeks respectively devoted to scholarly activity, didactic teaching and administrative service, and 4 weeks of vacation annually. Faculty with differing distributions of effort will have proportionally different benchmarks for individual categories.

1) Teaching
   a. A minimum of 12+ annual hours of lecture or lab in professional or graduate student curriculum.
   b. Accepts course Team Leadership as assigned by the department chair.
   c. Participates in at least 24-26 weeks of clinical teaching annually.
   d. Average student evaluations at least 3.5 for classroom and clinical teaching over probationary period.
   e. Must undergo at least 2) formative peer evaluations per year. The number of evaluations of clinical as compared to didactic teaching will reflect the candidate’s responsibilities and will be specified by the chair.

2) Graduate Students
   a. Primary Advisor for at least 1 graduate student (completed the program)
   b. Participated in at least 3 additional graduate committees.
   c. Expected to be actively involved in mentoring graduate students, both those in the candidate’s program as well as other graduate students who might benefit from the candidate’s expertise.

3) Clinical Practice
   a. Annual evaluations of clinical effectiveness must be supportive
   b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio, including but not limited to, engaging in good business practices, providing estimates of the cost of care, maintaining complete medical records, communicating conscientiously and effectively with clients and referring veterinarians, and capturing charges. Behaves in a consistently collegial fashion and fosters teamwork and positive working and learning environments.
   c. Supportive input from the director of the VMC.

4) Scholarly Activity:
   a. Program
      i. Develop a focused research program that is internationally recognized by peers
ii. Collaboration with relevant college and university programs and investigators is encouraged

b. Publications
   i. Sustained and connected publications with a thematic approach (for example: clinical area of specialty or stemming from research activities)
   ii. Must demonstrate leadership as the energizing or motivating force behind a body of work
   iii. Credit given for authoring an authoritative textbook
   iv. Publication record (not including publications given credit during first promotion):
      1. A minimum of 5 or more first, first coauthor, or senior author publications (authoritative reviews {maximum of 2} are acceptable but must be published in reputable peer-reviewed journals) OR
      2. 2 to 3 first, first coauthor, or senior author publications and editor/author of authoritative text AND
      3. 5 or more collaborative publications (second author or greater)

c. Funding
   i. Consistent efforts to obtain extramural funding in a focused area (as above in scholarly work)
   ii. Intramural funds may also be sought to enhance program development
   iii. Obtained at least 4 funded grants (at least 1 extramurally funded) as Principal Investigator in a focused area
      1. Chair to specify numbers in annual review meeting/letter
   iv. Publication record should reflect successful completion of projects
      a. Administrative Service: Membership on at least 4 departmental or higher level committees or the equivalent in administrative service as defined by the chair.
      b. Holds/has held a major administrative position in the department, VMC, or CVM college.
      c. Contributes leadership to the mission of VMC with, among other things, service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio.

5) Achieved peer recognition as an expert nationally and internationally.

Clinical Track Faculty

The following benchmarks are for a faculty member whose distribution of effort specifies 38-36 weeks of clinical practice and teaching, 12 weeks devoted to scholarly activity, didactic teaching, administrative service, and professional development, and 4 weeks of vacation annually. Faculty with differing distributions of effort will have proportionally different benchmarks for individual categories.

1) Teaching
   a. Teaches a minimum of 12+ annual hours of lecture or lab in professional or graduate student curriculum.
   b. Accepts course Team Leadership as assigned by the chair.
   c. Participates in at least 36 weeks of clinical teaching annually which includes clinical education and mentoring of professional students and house officers.
   d. Average student evaluations at least 3.5 for classroom and clinical teaching over period of evaluation.
e. Must undergo at least 2 formative peer evaluations per year. The number of evaluations of clinical and didactic teaching will reflect the candidate’s responsibilities and will be specified by the chair.

2) Clinical Practice
   a. Annual evaluations of clinical performance must be supportive.
   b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio, including but not limited to, engaging in good business practices, providing estimates of the cost of care, maintaining complete medical records, communicating conscientiously and effectively with clients and referring veterinarians, and capturing charges. Behaves in a consistently collegial fashion and fosters teamwork and positive working and learning environments.
   c. Supportive input from the director of the VMC.

3) Administrative Service
   a. Active membership and participation on at least 3 departmental or higher level committees (2 if chair of one of the committees) or the equivalent in administrative service as defined by the chair.
   b. Faculty member should demonstrate willingness to take on his/her share of committee work.

4) Scholarly Activity: Publications or other Scholarly Works
   a. A minimum of 2-4 additional works that may include either or a combination of
      i. Case series, case reports, results of collaborative or original research, book chapters, publications in professional journals (peer review not required).
      ii. Instructional videos or case simulations.
      iii. Other as agreed upon with the chair.

5) Scholarly Activity: Research
   a. Collaborative clinical research/scholarly efforts are expected.

6) Recognized by peers as an expert, achieved peer recognition nationally and internationally.

Research Emphasis Faculty

The following benchmarks are for a faculty member whose distribution of effort specifies 12 -13 weeks of patient care and clinical teaching, 36 -35 weeks devoted to scholarly activity, didactic teaching and administrative service, and 4 weeks of vacation annually. Faculty with differing distributions of effort will have proportionally different benchmarks for individual categories.

1) Scholarly Activity
   a. Program
      i. Develop an internationally recognized, focused research program.
      ii. Collaboration with relevant college and university programs and investigators is encouraged.
   b. Publications
i. Sustained and connected publications with a thematic approach. Must demonstrate leadership as the energizing or motivating force behind a body of work.

ii. Credit is given for authoritative texts (but this should not be the focus of work).

iii. Publication record (not including publications during first promotion cycle): minimum of 10 – 15 or more first, first coauthor, or senior author publications (authoritative reviews {maximum of 1} are acceptable but must be published in reputable peer-reviewed journals).

c. Funding

i. Regular attempts to obtain extramural funding, including submissions to agencies that support indirect costs.

ii. The research intensive faculty member should not be focused on intramural grants. Intramural funds may also be sought to enhance program development.

iii. Successful grantsmanship; obtained at least 5 funded grants (at least 3 extramurally funded) as Principal Investigator in a focused area; chair to specify numbers on an annual basis in annual review meeting/letter.

2) Graduate Students (not including students during first promotion cycle)

a. Primary advisor for at least 4 graduate students, at least 2 must be PhD students (all completed the program), AND

b. Participated in at least 4 additional graduate committees.

3) Teaching

a. Progressive increase in didactic lectures to achieve a minimum of 12+ annual hours of lecture or lab in professional or graduate student curriculum (2h lab = 1h lecture).

b. Accepts course Team Leadership as assigned by the department chair.

c. Participates in at least 12 -13 weeks of clinical teaching annually.

d. Average student evaluations at least 3.5 for classroom and clinical teaching over probationary period.

e. Must undergo at least 2 formative peer evaluations per year. The number of evaluations of clinical and didactic teaching will reflect the candidate’s responsibilities and will be specified by the chair.

4) Clinical Practice

a. Annual evaluations of clinical effectiveness must be supportive

b. Supports mission of Veterinary Medical Center with service to referring veterinarians and clients and outreach to the state of Ohio, including but not limited to, engaging in good business practices, providing estimates of the cost of care, maintaining complete medical records, communicating conscientiously and effectively with clients and referring veterinarians, and capturing charges. Behaves in a consistently collegial fashion and fosters teamwork and positive working and learning environments.

c. Supportive evaluation by the VMC director.

5) Administrative Service

a. Active membership and participation on at least 4 departmental or higher level committees (3 if chair of one of the committees) or the equivalent in administrative service as defined by the chair.
b. Faculty member should demonstrate willingness to take on his/her share of committee work.

6) Achieved peer recognition as an expert nationally/internationally.

Appendix B

Summary of Annual Classroom and Laboratory Teaching

To aid the process of reviewing your dossiers, please fill out the following form completely and accurately. Consult the website of the College of Veterinary Medicine for correct course titles and call numbers (for example, Small Animal Surgery, VCS 628). All recognized courses should be listed. Please indicate in which academic semesters you teach this course. Note the frequency of course offering if it is taught at greater than yearly intervals. Indicate the number of lecture hours that YOU give. Indicate the number of hours of laboratory instruction that YOU teach. Notice that you fill this chart out Semester by Semester for each year. For example, Fall 2012. Provide data for all your teaching if you are a probationary faculty member. If you are a non-probationary faculty member, provide data since your last promotion OR for the last 5
years, whichever is shortest. Indicate with an asterisk (*) all courses for which you are team leader. Expand the tables as much as necessary.

Name______________________________________________ Date____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE COURSES</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Lecture Hours</th>
<th>Lab Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELECTIVE COURSES</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Lecture Hours</th>
<th>Lab Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATE COURSES</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Lecture Hours</th>
<th>Lab Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHER COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Lecture Hours</th>
<th>Lab Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix C**

Record of Peer-Reviewed Publications
Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee
Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences

Name ____________________________  Date ____________________________  Page ___________

To aid the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee in accurately assessing your dossier, please fill out the following tables. INSTRUCTIONS
1. Use one table for **MANUSCRIPTS** and one for **ABSTRACTS**

2. Abbreviated title (so we can find the paper/abstract in the dossier) and year of publication

3. **First Co-Author:** You authored this manuscript with a graduate student or house officers

4. **Senior Author:** Your name appears last because that is the convention of the journal

5. **Greater than Third Author:** You are listed as fourth author or lower

6. **Total:** Give the total number of items in the column

7. **Probationary faculty member OR faculty member completing this form for the first time:**
   Provide data for all your peer-reviewed publications

8. **Non-probationary faculty member:** Provide data since your last promotion OR for the last 5 years, whichever is shortest

9. Expand the tables as much as necessary

Complete a **Separate Table** for each of the following:
- MANUSCRIPTS that have been published
- MANUSCRIPTS that have been submitted for review
- MANUSCRIPTS in the pipeline (anticipated, you are working on them but they are not yet submitted)
- ABSTRACTS
- Proceedings PAPERS
- Book chapters

**PUBLISHED MANUSCRIPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title/Journal/Year</th>
<th>First Author</th>
<th>Co-First Author</th>
<th>Senior Author</th>
<th>Second Author</th>
<th>Third Author</th>
<th>&gt;Third Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title/Journal/Year</th>
<th>First Author</th>
<th>Co-First Author</th>
<th>Senior Author</th>
<th>Second Author</th>
<th>Third Author</th>
<th>&gt;Third Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANUSCRIPTS IN THE PIPELINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title/Journal/Year</th>
<th>First Author</th>
<th>Co-First Author</th>
<th>Senior Author</th>
<th>Second Author</th>
<th>Third Author</th>
<th>&gt;Third Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ABSTRACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title/Journal/Year</th>
<th>First Author</th>
<th>Co-First Author</th>
<th>Senior Author</th>
<th>Second Author</th>
<th>Third Author</th>
<th>&gt;Third Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title/Journal/Year</th>
<th>First Author</th>
<th>Co-First Author</th>
<th>Senior Author</th>
<th>Second Author</th>
<th>Third Author</th>
<th>&gt;Third Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BOOK CHAPTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title/Journal/Year</th>
<th>First Author</th>
<th>Co-First Author</th>
<th>Senior Author</th>
<th>Second Author</th>
<th>Third Author</th>
<th>&gt;Third Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Record of Funding
Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee
Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences

Name_________________________ Date _________________________ Page __________

Please complete the following tables to aid the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee in accurately assessing your dossier.

INSTRUCTIONS
1. Please divide the entries into the two major categories of Intramural and Extramural funding
2. **Primary investigator:** You were the primary investigator on the grant, and were primarily responsible for drafting the proposal or you were the co-primary investigator with a graduate student or house officers
3. **Co-investigator:** You were not the primary investigator
4. **Competitive Grants:** Were subject to peer review by funding agency. Name agency (i.e. NIH)
5. **Contract Grants:** Were funded through a contract with an agency such as a pharmaceutical company. Name company (i.e. Pfizer)
6. **Name:** Abbreviated title of grant. Give enough detail so grant can be located in the dossier
7. **Funding Dates:** List dates of funding (i.e. 2004-2007)
8. **Total:** Give the total number of items in the column or the total dollar amount as appropriate
9. **Probationary faculty member:** Provide data for all of your grants
10. **Non-probationary faculty member:** Provide data since your last promotion OR for the last 5 years, whichever is shortest
11. Expand the tables as much as necessary

### EXTRAMURAL GRANTS

#### PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Funding Dates</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COINVESTIGATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Funding Dates</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INTRAMURAL GRANTS
### PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Funding Dates</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COINVESTIGATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Funding Dates</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E

**OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL DESIGN AND SYSTEMS STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF INSTRUCTOR**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor communicated his/her subject matter well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor emphasized particularly important material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor stimulated interest in the course subject.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL DESIGN AND SYSTEMS STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF COURSE**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods used in this course were effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work required was appropriate for the credit hours earned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams or other assessments measured my learning/understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching team exhibited concern and respect for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I believe the course was effectively presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Peer Review & Development of Teaching
Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences
Updated Report from the Mentoring & Professional Development Subcommittee
November 2009

Introduction: Evaluation of teaching is a complicated and complex process that has nonetheless been embraced and advanced by the University and College. “Evaluation of the quality of university teaching is a complex, multifaceted process that should include student, peer, administrative and self-evaluation” (from University Senate Peer Review of Teaching report; see http://senate.osu.edu/PeerEvalTeach.html).

This document summarizes the approach taken by the Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences relative to these four levels of teaching evaluation and outlines specific elements of evaluative and formative programs in support of teaching excellence in Veterinary Clinical Sciences.

Requirements: University rules require Student Evaluations of Teaching/Instruction for all faculty members, and consideration of student evaluations as a requirement for promotion and tenure at the Ohio State University. University rules also indicate the critical importance of peer evaluation of teaching; however, exact methods of peer assessment are not specified in university rules aside from the provision that peer evaluation is a departmental function.

There are two faculty-centered programs guiding peer evaluation of teaching in VCS:
1) The Assessment of Student Evaluations of Teaching at the P&T subcommittee level and
2) The Development of Teaching Program in Veterinary Clinical Sciences.

Evaluative Program: The first program, the Assessment of Student Evaluations of Teaching, is evaluative. The data evaluated are each faculty member’s Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) or Instruction (SEI), with a secondary assessment of a faculty member’s Teaching Portfolio.

Responsibility: The significance of student evaluations is assessed at the faculty level by members of the Departmental Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure and jointly at the administrative level by the Department Chair using criteria established by the Faculty.

Administration: Collection of SET/SEI is the responsibility of the Office of Educational Design & Systems. VCS program administration is the joint responsibility of the P&T Subcommittee and the VCS Chair.

Developmental Program: The second program encompasses a formative system of individual development supported by peer review and Departmental support of teaching. This program is designed to advance each faculty member as a classroom and clinical instructor, and to enhance the quality of professional and graduate education overall in our department.

Responsibility: This developmental program of teaching is accomplished through 1) individual effort; 2) peer activities (review and coaching); and 3) departmental initiatives that enhance the quality and culture of teaching.

Administration: Overall coordination of this program is the responsibility of the Departmental Subcommittee for Faculty Mentoring (SFM), with input from the Professional Education Committee, Post-Professional (Graduate) Education Committee, and the Department Chair.
Program 1 – Assessment of Students Evaluations of Teaching

This program comprises a faculty- (peer-) assessment of our students’ comments regarding faculty instruction. These comments are derived from core, elective, and graduate courses and should be coordinated with the College office of Educational Design & Systems (EDS). This review is compulsory for probationary faculty and for those seeking promotion in VCS (OSU requirements). The peer assessment of these student evaluations of teaching is conducted by the P&T subcommittee during regular or ad hoc meetings. The specific elements of this program include: 1) review of SET/SEI scores; 2) review of faculty members’ Teaching Portfolios; and 3) application of standardized methods of evaluation (i.e., those established by the Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure and Department Chairperson). Metrics related to teaching within the department and the CVM have been collected, analyzed, and distributed to faculty and to the P&T subcommittee.

I. Data Collected

A. SET (SEI) numerical scores from students are collected for all VCS faculty members teaching in courses at the following levels:
   - Core professional – coordinated with EDS using the Council on Education (COE) guidelines for core professional course evaluations
   - Elective – coordinated with EDS but structured by VCS
   - Clinical – coordinated with EDS but structured by VCS
   - Graduate-Resident – these may be coordinated with EDS or VCS Departmental staff

   The specific evaluation instruments used for Elective, Clinical and Graduate teaching surveys are established by the Post-Professional Education and P&T committees.

B. Teaching Portfolios should be developed and maintained by each individual faculty member and follow a standardized VCS reporting format (also see below). Guidelines for the Teaching Portfolio have been established by the Mentoring subcommittee with input from the P&T subcommittee & faculty. The document: Guidelines for Creating a Basic Teaching Portfolio is available on the VCS website or shared drive. Faculty members can personalize the contents of their portfolio within the general guidelines for this document.

II. Methods of Evaluation

A. SET/SEI scores
   - Evaluations obtained from College and Departmental SETs/SEIs are collected in a standardized fashion at the conclusion of all courses.
   - The Department establishes with the College specific evaluation instrument items considered appropriate for Student Evaluation of Instruction in elective and clinical courses in which our faculty participate. Our representatives on the COE should be active in helping to develop evaluation instruments suitable for our faculty teaching in the core (preclinical) curriculum.
   - It is particularly important that VCS-directed evaluation instruments be used for Student Evaluation of Instruction in elective courses, clinical rotations, and graduate courses.
   - These evaluations should include both standardized questions and customized items whenever possible.
   - The Department collects and calculates descriptive statistics (counts, quartiles, medians/means, variance, trends, indexing methods, etc.) for the departmental faculty, and where available for the CVM overall, for development of evaluation standards. These statistics are used by the P&T subcommittee and VCS Chair in assessing SETs/SEIs.
Issues related to Assessment of faculty members’ SEIs/SETs: Assessments of SEIs/SETs are not always straightforward and should be guided by standards established by the P&T subcommittee with the input of the Department Chair and the faculty at large. The following points may be worthy of consideration in such deliberations.

- **Absolute cut-offs could be used as a screen** above which no further peer assessment is required. For instance if the average threshold score is >3.X, no further consideration is needed (with these “cut-offs” differing for core, elective, and clinical courses.) The development of “cut-offs” requires careful analysis of teaching evaluation scores across the curriculum and discussion among the faculty regarding the culture and expectations for teaching in this department.

- **Another example of data analysis** could involve indexing of student evaluation scores to the overall course evaluations for *team-taught* courses. Indexing may “correct” for student evaluations of faculty teaching in unpopular subjects courses or in courses impacted by low scores from other instructors. However, our experience with such indexing has indicated a marked inflation of adjusted compared to raw scores; accordingly, adjusted scores should simply be used to guide the overall evaluation of SEIs and are not a substitute for the actual student evaluation scores.

- **The overall variance in instructors’ scores** may also be meaningful, since a large variance might indicate that students interested in the subject evaluate the instructor with higher scores compared to those who have low interest. Again, this type of information should be considered by the P&T subcommittee and the Chair’s office when providing feedback to individual faculty members.

- **Further indexing could be used relative to student interests.** For example, students could rank themselves as 1 (small animal exclusive) to 3 (mixed species) to 5 (large animal exclusive) in terms of their interest. SET scores could be indexed to student interest scores, which might provide some insight regarding wide variances in SET values for a given instructor. Currently, this is not part of the CVM or Departmental assessments, but individual faculty members could pursue these additional metrics if they believe these will be meaningful.

- **Whatever statistics are generated and “standards” are chosen, these must be discussed widely among the faculty at large and the eventual standards applied uniformly at both the P&T and Departmental levels.** Sufficient samples must be obtained. When a small proportion of a student class submits evaluations, the method for insuring random sampling must also be considered by evaluators.

- **When SET scores suggest a potential problem,** the P&T committee or the Department Chair further assesses the situation, including evaluation of the summary statistics and the Teaching Portfolio, before making a recommendation.

- **Handling low SET scores:** When the final assessment of the P&T Subcommittee or Department Chair about a faculty member’s SETs indicates that a colleague might benefit from more intensive mentoring (in terms of instructional delivery), the issue is referred to the faculty member’s *personal mentoring committee.* If the faculty member is no longer probationary and does not have a mentoring committee, the Chair will refer the mentoring issue directly to the Departmental SFM.

- **Anticipated results:** It is expected that only a handful of instructors in VCS will fall below the threshold each year, and only these individuals will require further coaching or assistance to elevate their SET scores. However, ALL faculty members, regardless of SET scores, will be encouraged to participate in the Development of Teaching in VCS program (see below).

### B. Teaching Portfolios

- **The Subcommittee on Faculty Mentoring** – in consultation with the P&T Subcommittee, the Professional Education Committee, the faculty, and the Department Chair – is charged with developing guidelines for the VCS Teaching Portfolio.

- One proposal that merits discussion by the faculty relates to the system used in PAES Department at OSU. We could modify this to a simplified “points system” to allow faculty to document activities designed to advance teaching skills.
As an example (only), probationary faculty might be required to earn “3 points” yearly; associate professors “2 points” yearly; full professors “1 point” yearly.

As another example, a clinician-educator might be required to participate in more wide-ranging activities; whereas, a research-intensive colleague might be expected to experience a more limited educational activity range.

“Points” might be obtained in multiple ways, such as reading papers about education, attending seminars (including faculty development series seminars), helping junior faculty by observing them in the classroom; being observed by a peer and writing a one-page summary about how this influenced teaching; etc.

There are ample examples of developmental peer review activities on campus, with the Department of PAES serving as one of the most notable and accepted on campus (see the following link for examples:


It is critical that the system for recording and reporting activities in the Teaching Portfolio not be complicated or too time consuming. Optimally this system could be linked to the developing OSU Pro reporting system for academic activities or some other on-line repository of information.

Faculty relying on teaching as a prime criterion for academic advancement should develop a robust Portfolio that documents their commitment and expertise to education.

All faculty members should be able to document some activities yearly with respect to development as an educator, though the reporting for senior or research intensive faculty should be less detailed than for probationary faculty or those seeking promotion based mainly on teaching.

The Teaching Portfolio is aimed mainly at Program 2 (see below), but can also be useful in providing a perspective during P&T and administrative assessments of the SETs (Program 1).

The “list” of specific activities acceptable for development of the teaching portfolio requires widespread input from faculty and from other departments that successfully use teaching portfolios for developing faculty members as instructors. A suggested initial list is indicated below.

C. A Partial List of Teaching Activities

- Attend VCS or CVM seminars about teaching
- Attend university seminars about teaching
- Attend a short-course about teaching
- Read a book about teaching
- Read selected journal articles about teaching
- Peer review/Coach a colleague in the classroom
- Peer review/Coach a colleague in the clinical or laboratory setting
- Peer review/Coach a colleague relative to lecture content, visuals, and handouts
- Provide a constructive review of a course syllabus
- Provide a constructive review of a course lecture handout(s)
- Provide a constructive review of a course website
- Be reviewed by a colleague in the classroom, laboratory, or clinic and write a one-page summary of how this experience impacted your teaching
- Observe an “expert” or “master” teacher in the classroom, lab, or clinic and write a one-page summary of how this experience impacted your teaching
- Mentor a house officer (resident/grad student/TA) to make them a better teacher
- Videotape yourself teaching and write a one-page summary of how this experience influenced your future teaching
- Develop new lecture(s) or laboratory or learning activity(ies) for a course
- Develop new handout materials/notes/reference materials for students
- Develop a new course
- Develop/implement new teaching methods
- Develop new on-line (E-learning) teaching materials or methods
- Enhance a course web-site using Carmen
- Demonstrate innovation in the classroom
- Demonstrate innovation in the teaching laboratory
- Demonstrate innovation in clinical teaching
- Demonstrate innovation in distance/computer based/e-learning
- Document teaching of graduate students in the research setting
- Use new software/media and provide examples of how these were used in your teaching
- Perform research (present/publish) related to veterinary teaching/learning/pedagogy
- Serve on the editorial board of an educational journal
- Organize/lead seminars or discussion groups that reflect on veterinary education
- Write an article or book chapter about teaching/learning/veterinary education
- Survey students to identify important trends and perceptions – summarize the results and how these were used
- Summarize in writing your teaching philosophy and how you apply this in your work
- Describe in writing how you have developed as a teacher during the past year and indicate specific examples to document your development
- Others

Again, for more examples see:


D. Outline for a Teaching Portfolio

The Mentoring subcommittee has created a simple document “Guidelines for Creating a Basic Teaching Portfolio”; additionally general information (summarized below) is excerpted from the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT) at Ohio State; see:
http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching_portfolio/feedback.html

From the UCAT Website:

What is a portfolio?

As an academic, there are different types of portfolios that you might prepare. These include the course portfolio, the professional (scholar) portfolio, and the teaching portfolio.

A course portfolio includes information specific to a particular course. Such a portfolio would include syllabi, course materials, sample assignments, and an explanation for the rationale behind the assignments, and how your teaching methods and your course materials help students learn.

A professional portfolio is a collection of documents that you might submit as you go through the promotion and tenure process. This type of portfolio would include all of your work as a scholar, including your research progress, your teaching experience and accomplishments, as well as your record of academic service.

The teaching portfolio describes and documents multiple aspects of your teaching ability. There are two basic types of portfolio.

A summative portfolio is created for the purpose of applying for an academic job or for promotion and tenure within a department. (Note: this information is found in the Dossier and is not the intent of the VCS Teaching Portfolio).

A formative portfolio is created for the purpose of personal and professional development.
Because your teaching experience changes as your career progresses, it is a good idea to periodically update your portfolio(s) in order to keep current with your progress, and to give yourself a regular opportunity to reflect on your teaching. At some point in your career, you may find that you need to keep a summative as well as a formative portfolio, since they serve different purposes; note, though, that those two portfolios may have several materials in common. The materials provided here focus on the teaching portfolio.

Some people describe a teaching portfolio as a place to summarize your teaching accomplishments and provide examples of classroom material. Others describe it as a mechanism and space for reflecting upon your teaching. And for the rest of us, it can be described as a space to do both.

**What are some characteristics of effective portfolios?**
The format of a portfolio varies considerably. An effective portfolio should be well documented and organized. The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) suggests that a teaching portfolio should be structured, representative, and selective.

**Structured** – A structured portfolio should be organized, complete, and creative in its presentation. Some questions for you to think about might be: Is my portfolio neat? Are the contents displayed in an organized fashion? Are the contents representative for the purpose that it is intended?

**Representative** – In addition to attending to structure, a portfolio should also be comprehensive. The documentation should represent the scope of one’s work. It should be representative across courses and time. Some questions for you think about might be: Does my portfolio portray the types and levels of courses that I have taught? Does my portfolio display a cross-section of my work in teaching?

**Selective** – The natural tendency for anyone preparing a portfolio is wanting to document everything. However, if a portfolio is being used either for summative or formative purposes, careful attention should be given to conciseness and selectivity in order to appropriately document one’s work. Peter Seldin (1997) suggests limiting the contents of a portfolio to ten pages. We suggest that you limit the contents of your portfolio to what is required by the reviewer while also keeping the purpose in mind.

**What are some key functions of a teaching portfolio?**
- It is a way to collect evidence of your teaching ability.
- It provides the reader with a context for your teaching.
- It provides summary data on your teaching in a simple, readable format.
- It is focused on quality, not quantity.
- It is organized and its various sections relate to each other.
- It is an ever-changing, living document.
- It allows for self-reflection.
- It provides an opportunity to be unique and showcase your personal style of teaching.
- The process of creating one is generally much more important and meaningful than the end product.

**Why create a portfolio?**
The teaching portfolio can serve many purposes, some of which include the following:
- Reflecting on your goals as a teacher
- Assessing your teaching strengths and areas which need improvement
- Documenting your progress as a teacher
- Generating ideas for future teaching/course development
- Identifying your personal teaching style
- Using elements of the portfolio to promote dialogue with fellow teachers
- Considering new ways of gathering student feedback
- Gathering detailed data to support your goals
III. Outcomes of Peer & Administrative Assessments

The following are general recommendations for outcome assessments of the peer review processes summarized in this document.

For probationary faculty members, the evaluation of their SET scores and their Teaching Portfolio is part of the annual dossier review by the Subcommittee on Promotion & Tenure.

For all faculty members, the evaluation of their SET scores and Teaching Portfolio are part of the annual performance review by the Department Chair.

B. Faculty assessments of SETs can be classified as:
1) Meeting (or exceeding) VCS standards
2) Marginal relative to VCS standards – careful assessment of supplementary statistics, written student comments, and the Teaching Portfolio are indicated; refer if necessary to the faculty member’s individual mentoring committee for support/coaching
3) Below VCS standards with clear need for improvement of performance – refer to the faculty member’s individual mentoring committee; develop plan for improvement; reevaluate performance at scheduled intervals

C. Faculty assessments of the Teaching Portfolio can be classified as:
1) Meeting (or exceeding) VCS standards
2) Marginal relative to VCS standards – Greater activity is recommended
3) Does not meet VCS standards – refer to faculty member’s individual mentoring committee; develop plan for improvement; reevaluate Portfolio at 6-month intervals.

IV. Additional Issues (and potential action items) related to summative evaluation of faculty:

- This limb is the evaluative part of peer assessment. The faculty and administrative review is an assessment of evaluations contributed by others (students in the form of SETs and the faculty member in terms of the personal Portfolio). Based on the results of the survey
- Based on our departmental history & culture, the vast majority of faculty will likely fall into classifications 1 relative to SETs. Most faculty members in classifications 2 and 3 are likely to improve significantly with peer support and guidance.
- Faculty falling in SET class 3 should receive intensive coaching from their mentoring committee and assistance from UCAT or other experts if necessary.
- VCS must gain some control of SETs/SEIs (using both innovative technical and sound educational approaches to streamline the process) – we need to ask relevant questions and also allow for some customization so we can learn answers to questions of importance to our teachers
- Teaching portfolios should be a standard to document advancement for all teaching faculty in VCS. This is especially important for those with relatively small research commitments or colleagues expecting promotion based almost entirely on teaching excellence.
- Standards for evaluation of SEIs are needed for standards-based assessments (descriptive statistics; comparative data; trends; historical data from VCS and the CVM)
- Those responsible for coordinating peer assessment and review programs should identify specific references that document applicable educational methods and theories whenever possible.
Specific instructions & expectations for a high quality, teaching portfolio can be developed from the literature; some "samples" are also needed. The initial portfolio must be simple and clear. Faculty with interests in developing extensive portfolios should be able to build on the basic structure.

Program 2 – Development of Teaching in VCS

I. Purpose

Program 2 is developmental or formative. The program aims to support faculty and enhance education by creating an environment that helps each of us become a better teacher. The central caveats are:

1) Each of us has something to offer regarding education of our professional, post-graduate, and graduate students.
2) Our desire to improve and our personal endeavors will impact our success as educators.
3) Each of us can benefit from guidance and support from our colleagues.
4) Through Departmental activities – seminars, programs, and other forms of support – the culture and practices of teaching can be advanced to the benefit of our students and our faculty.

II. Development of Teaching Program: General organization:

This program is largely peer-driven and is coordinated by the SFM with input from the Professional Education Committee and Department Administration. The Development of Teaching Program will leverage a faculty known for high-quality teaching along with two existing academic programs: the Faculty Mentoring Committees and the monthly Professional Development Seminars. This program will focus on three activities: 1) Personal development; 2) Peer support and coaching; and 3) Departmental programs. For faculty members wanting to provide formative peer evaluation support to faculty members on their mentoring committee(s) the “Quick Start Guidelines” document and the “Peer Evaluation Classroom Form” are available to streamline activities. These brief documents are guides to getting the process going.

1) Personal development as an educator is part of the development of all faculty members and is a somewhat unique, though shared process for an individual. For this portion of the program faculty members assess their own needs and interests. Using the “activities list” as a guide, the faculty member selects from specific activities deemed important for personal development. These activities are documented in the Teaching Portfolio. An example of an activities list related to development as a teacher is summarized beginning on page 6 on the OSU-PAES website:


2) Guidance and support from peers is focused in the personal mentoring committees, which have been assigned to all probationary and new faculty members. One-on-one coaching between colleagues is the goal here. It is also appropriate for mentored faculty to ask for input from others outside their mentoring committee (suggestions can come from their own committee or from the Departmental SFM). These peer review activities also can be logged in the Teaching Portfolio. For senior faculty members without mentoring committees, it is
suggested that faculty members obtain feedback from other senior (or junior) colleagues as deemed useful.

3) *Departmental programs* can help disseminate knowledge related to veterinary education, including the science and scholarship of teaching and learning. The Faculty Development Series will focus some months on educational topics. The Department may also see merit in supporting specific educational or research endeavors aimed at improving 1) Pre-clinical (professional), 2) Elective (professional), 3) Clinical (professional), 4) Clinical (post-graduate), and 5) Graduate education. The seminar series might consider a number of topics, including:

- **Teaching portfolios** – Creating “teaching portfolios” and using personalized portfolios to develop as a teacher
- **Instructional delivery** – Enhancing presentation and communication; classroom behaviors; use of content delivery software; multimedia
- **Instructional design** – Improving course structure and curricular development; Reviewing course content to meet meaningful learning outcomes
- **Pedagogy** – the science and the art of teaching | Instructional strategies
  a. General aspects of learning theory
  b. Seminars on education principles and practice
  c. Discussions of “best practices” as these relate specifically to the five types of instruction (noted above)
  d. Innovations in teaching
  e. Application of technology to teaching
- **Outcome assessments** – Measuring teaching/learning success (beyond the AVMA “requirements”)
- **Activities that enhance the scholarship (research) of teaching** – Conducting and participating in studies that quantify learning outcomes or test hypotheses regarding teaching in the veterinary or lab environment.

### III. Measuring Success of the Development of Teaching Program

The success of the Program will be determined by the following:

1) Perceptions of VCS faculty members based on results of a yearly survey
2) Positive trends in SET/SEI
3) Quantitation of activities related to veterinary education, including teaching awards, programs, lectures, publications, studies, etc.

The program will be modified based on identified needs and suggestions from faculty and staff.

### IV. Key Points regarding the Development of Teaching Program

- No “scores” or “grades” are ever assigned
- Evaluative records are maintained only by those directly involved in the experiences
- Assessments are shared only between mentee and coach
- Group activities should enhance the climate and culture of teaching and learning
- Activities that quantify outcomes of student learning are encouraged and considered integral to the success of the Departmental portion of the Program
- The Development of Teaching program should foster an environment where teaching is highly valued and individuals see paths for personal growth as educators and investigators in the field of veterinary education.
DEPARTMENT OF VETERINARY CLINICAL SCIENCES
PEER EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING – Guidelines (ver. 4/2011)

To the evaluator: The following checklist is simply a guide for your peer evaluation and should be supplemented with written and verbal comments regarding these (or other pertinent) aspects of teaching performance. Please identify both strengths & weaknesses of the teaching experience offering specific examples and constructive suggestions for future consideration. It is also very important to schedule a specific time in the near future to discuss your evaluation with the mentee.

To the mentored faculty member: Completed Peer Evaluation Forms (and any attached written comments) are private communications between you and your peer evaluator and not placed in your dossier; however, you should include a reflective statement about this interaction in your Teaching Portfolio. For example, indicate how this interaction/evaluation might affect or impact your teaching.

Faculty Member Reviewed: ________________________________   Date of Review: ________________

Reviewer: ________________________   Venue (bldg/room/area): ________________________

Class or Lecture Title/Subject: _____________________________________________________________

Class Year(s): ________   Course (name or number): _____________ Core or Elective: _______________

1. Did the instructor start and finish on time?

2. Did the instructor speak clearly & audibly and at a reasonable pace?
   Were there any mannerisms or presentation methods, such as pointer use, worthy of comment?

3. Did the presentation seem to pertain to the assigned/scheduled topic(s)?

4. Was the presentation content updated to current developments in veterinary medicine?

5. Was the faculty member well prepared for the class?

6. Were the key facts, concepts, and applications presented & explained logically?

7. Were the class handouts/outlines sufficient to support the classroom presentation?

8. Were the technical aspects of the presentation (PowerPoint “slides”; images; video; audio) satisfactory?

9. Did the instructor involve or engage the students in the learning process? How was this achieved?

10. Did the instructor pause & solicit as well as answer questions appropriately?

   The above questions are typical considerations for assessing classroom teaching.
   Please use the other side of this form to outline what was particularly effective in this lecture and offer any specific suggestions for improvement or future consideration.

VCS Mentoring Subcommittee: Mod 4/1/2011
DEPARTMENT OF VETERINARY CLINICAL SCIENCES
PEER EVALUATION OF CLINICAL TEACHING – Guidelines (ver. 4/2011)

To the evaluator: The following checklist is simply a guide for your peer evaluation and should be supplemented with written and verbal comments regarding these (or other pertinent) aspects of teaching performance. It is also very important to schedule a specific time in the near future to discuss your evaluation with the mentee.

To the mentored faculty member: Completed Peer Evaluation Forms (and any attached written comments) are private communications between you and your peer evaluator and are not included in your dossier; however, you should include a reflective statement about this interaction in your Teaching Portfolio. For example, indicate how this interaction/evaluation might influence or impact your teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Instructor &amp; Instructional Characteristics</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructional content presented by the instructor seemed accurate, evidence-based, and current (answer only if you are comfortable assessing the content)</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The instructor communicated the subject content effectively</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The instructor demonstrated enthusiasm and interest in clinical teaching</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructor spoke in a clear and audible manner</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The instructor engaged students into discussions regarding clinical cases</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The instructor encouraged student involvement with cases</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The instructor created a climate conducive to learning that included engagement and respect for students</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The instructor answered student questions clearly</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The instructor offered explanations at a level(s) appropriate for the audience</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Overall, the instructor was an effective clinical educator</td>
<td>☐ Exceeds expectations ☐ Meets expectations ☐ Below expectations ☐ Did not or cannot assess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If box contains a √ = see comments written on the opposite side (or attached sheet).

Other instructional topics that might be evaluated by the peer evaluator include: 1) Instructor provides clear performance expectations; 2) Instructor creates supplementary teaching materials for clinical education; 3) Instructor helps students organize their time for efficient clinical practice and learning; 4) Instructor provides timely feedback to students, including student grading.

APPENDIX G
LETTER DOCUMENTING PEER REVIEW

Date

Dr. Rustin M. Moore
Professor and Chair
Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences
College of Veterinary Medicine
The Ohio State University
601 Tharp Street
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Dr. Moore,

This letter is to inform you that I performed a formative peer evaluation of teaching for Dr. _____________ on _____ (date) ____ during a lecture/laboratory/small group teaching in clinics (circle one) for __________________ (course #) ___________ and __________________ (course name) ____________. I also evaluated the learning objectives/PowerPoint presentation/class notes/self-study cases/ and/or other supporting materials.

I met with Dr. _________________ on _____ (date) _____ to discuss the results of my observations and evaluation and to provide suggestions for improvement. Dr. _________________ has reflected on this review in his/her teaching portfolio.

Sincerely,

Name
Title
Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences
The Ohio State University
APPENDIX H
Candidate’s Comment/Rebuttal Letter

If a candidate wishes to submit a letter of clarification/rebuttal, such a letter should be submitted – in lieu of this form letter – within ten (10) days of the receipt of the questioned/disputed document. Otherwise, this form letter should be submitted.

Date:

Dr. Rustin M. Moore
Professor and Chair
Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences
College of Veterinary Medicine
The Ohio State University
601 Tharp Street
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Dr. Moore:

This is to inform you that after having reviewed my (Check all that apply):

☐ Letter from the COEF

☐ Chair’s letter regarding ☐ promotion/tenure ☐ reappointment

I do not intend to submit a letter of clarification/rebuttal.

Sincerely,

Name
Title