

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures Department of Veterinary Biosciences

Approved by the Faculty: November 14, 2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: December 3, 2025

Table of Contents

I. PREAMBLE	5
II. DEPARTMENT MISSION	5
III. DEFINITIONS	6
A. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY (CEF)	6
A.1. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	6
A.2. CLINICAL FACULTY	7
A.3. RESEARCH FACULTY	7
A.4. ASSOCIATED FACULTY	8
B. CONFLICT OF INTEREST.....	8
C. MINIMUM COMPOSITION	9
D. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY (FORMERLY THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE)	9
E. QUORUM FOR MEETINGS OF THE CEF	9
F. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY	10
IV. APPOINTMENTS	10
A. CRITERIA	10
A.1. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	11
A2. CLINICAL FACULTY	12
A3. RESEARCH FACULTY	13
A4. ASSOCIATED FACULTY	13
A5. EMERITUS FACULTY	14
A6. JOINT APPOINTMENTS	15
A7. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR FACULTY	15
B. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT.....	15
B1. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	16
B2. CLINICAL FACULTY	17
B3. RESEARCH FACULTY	17
B4. TRANSFER FROM THE TENURE TRACK	18
B5. TIU TRANSFER	18

B6. ASSOCIATED FACULTY	18
B7 JOINT APPOINTMENTS	19
B8. COURTESY APPOINTMENT FOR FACULTY	19
V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW	19
A. INTRODUCTION	19
B. DOCUMENTATION	20
C. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW	20
C1. INITIATION OF THE ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS	20
C2. PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK FACULTY	20
C3. FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK FACULTY	21
C4. EXTENSION OF THE TENURE CLOCK	22
C5. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY	22
C6. ANNUAL REVIEW OF CLINICAL FACULTY	22
C7. ANNUAL REVIEW OF RESEARCH FACULTY	23
C8. ANNUAL REVIEW OF ASSOCIATED AND COURTESY FACULTY	23
D. SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS	24
VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	24
A. CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION	24
A1. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE	25
A2. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR	28
B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF CLINICAL FACULTY	29
B1. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF CLINICAL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	29
B2. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	29
C3. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF CLINICAL PROFESSOR	32
E. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF RESEARCH FACULTY	33
E1. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	33
E2. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF RESEARCH PROFESSOR	33
F. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF ASSOCIATED FACULTY	34
G. REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE	34

G1. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-TRACK, CLINICAL, AND RESEARCH FACULTY	34
G2. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES	34
G3. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY (CEF) RESPONSIBILITIES.....	37
G4. DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON RESPONSIBILITIES	39
H. PROCEDURES FOR ASSOCIATED FACULTY	40
I. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS	40
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS.....	42
VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS.....	43
IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	43
A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING	43
A1. STUDENT EVALUATIONS FOR COURSES TAUGHT INSIDE THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE.....	43
A2. STUDENT EVALUATIONS FOR COURSES TAUGHT OUTSIDE THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE	43
B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	43
APPENDIX.....	45

I. Preamble

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Department Mission

Purpose: We discover the mechanisms of disease. We use this knowledge to educate others and to develop and utilize tools for disease diagnosis, treatment, and intervention to improve the health of animals and humans.

Beneficiaries: The beneficiaries of our work are

- those we train: students (professional, undergraduate, and graduate students) and advanced trainees such as residents, postdoctoral researchers, and fellows
- those for whom we provide diagnostic service (patients and their owners, clinicians, researchers), and
- those whose health and well-being we improve through advances in veterinary and human medicine.

Deliverables:

Education:

- We help provide the foundational pre-clinical and pathology curriculum to veterinary professional students.

- We help develop the next generation of scientists and clinician scientists by educating and graduating PhD and MS students.
- We advance the future of veterinary pathology by training and mentoring board-certified veterinary pathologists.

Research:

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

Clinical services:

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

Values:

Our values are in line with The Ohio State University's [Shared Values](#).

III. Definitions

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

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the department.

The department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

A.1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment (Hiring) Reviews

Appointment Review. The initial appointment of tenure track faculty is based on search committee recommendations to the department chair. The search committee will not select the candidates to be appointed but rather make recommendations as to whether candidates are acceptable for the positions.

Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.

For the promotion reviews of associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

A.2. Clinical Faculty

Initial Appointment (Hiring or Appointment Change from another Faculty Type) Reviews

Appointment Review. The initial appointment of clinical faculty is based on search committee recommendations to the department chair. The search committee will not select the candidates to be appointed but rather make recommendations as to whether candidates are acceptable for the positions.

Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, all nonprobationary associate clinical professors, and all nonprobationary clinical professors.

For the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate clinical professors and the reappointment reviews of clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary clinical professors.

A.3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment (Hiring or Appointment Change from another Faculty Type) Reviews

Appointment Review. The initial appointment of research faculty is based on search committee recommendations to the department chair. The search committee will not select the candidates to be appointed but rather make recommendations as to whether candidates are acceptable for the positions.

Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

For the reappointment and promotion reviews of research associate professors and the reappointment reviews of research professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary research professors.

A.4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment (Hiring or Appointment Change from another Faculty Type) and Reappointment Reviews

The initial appointment of compensated associated faculty is based on search committee recommendations to the department chair. Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary clinical faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean. For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all those with nonprobationary clinical titles and tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2, or 3 above.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee.

B. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process if the member:

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- has substantive financial ties with the candidate;
- is dependent in some way on the candidate's services;
- has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when the faculty is or has been one of following to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations

- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

Such faculty members will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

C. Minimum Composition

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

D. Committee of the Eligible Faculty (formerly the Promotion and Tenure Committee)

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

CEF membership will include, as appropriate to the case under consideration, all tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty. Attendance at the meetings is mandatory for faculty not on approved leave of absence and will be restricted to those faculty holding higher rank than the candidate being considered and be subject to limitations based on faculty rules [3335-7-04](#) and [3335-7-37](#), which specify governance rights for clinical and research faculty.

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

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

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

E. Quorum for Meetings of the CEF

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is a two-thirds majority of the faculty eligible to vote and not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

F. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters will be either "yes" and "no" votes. Abstentions are strongly discouraged for promotion and tenure reviews. 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. But participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-ways electronic connection are allowed.

1. Appointment

In the Department of Veterinary Biosciences search committees make initial appointment recommendations to the department chair. Their evaluation does not include a vote of the eligible faculty.

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to the appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

IV. Appointments

Faculty appointments are made after determination of the category and rank of the proposed position and identification of the faculty candidate. The candidate must fulfill the criteria for the category which will be determined at the initiation of the search. In addition, the rank of the candidate must be determined based on the criteria presented below. If the candidate is determined to be appointed above the rank of assistant professor, then the CEF will meet to determine if the record of the candidate meets the criteria for both category and rank. This process must be completed before a formal offer can be made. Prior approval by the college dean and the Office of Academic Affairs is required for appointments at the rank of:

- tenure-track associate professor and professor
- clinical associate professor and clinical professor
- research associate professor and research professor, and
- associate professor and professor within any appointment type of compensated associated faculty as well as appointments at the rank of senior lecturer.

Tenure-track faculty appointment offers that entail prior service credit also require prior approval of the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. Please see the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for further details.

A. Criteria

The department is committed to scientific excellence, academic performance, and citizenship. It is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the

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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment.

All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

A.1. Tenure-track faculty

1a. Instructor

Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, 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 once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

1b. Assistant Professor

An earned terminal doctoral degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential to establish an independent and extramurally funded research program, for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory review for promotion and tenure occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review

for promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory sixth year review year is possible when the CEF determine such a review to be appropriate (see section VI. A3). The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

1c. Associate Professor or Professor

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Please see the criteria for promotion of assistant to associate professor (see section VI.B). Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor 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.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible.

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

A2. Clinical Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other clinical faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate clinical professors are not probationary and must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. The possibility of reappointment will be discussed in the faculty's annual review preceding the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information, see [Faculty Rule 3335-7](#).

2a. Clinical Instructor

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

2b. Clinical Assistant Professor

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

2c. Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor

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

A3. Research Faculty

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

3a. Research Assistant Professor

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

3b. Research Associate Professor and Research Professor

Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for scholarship for promotion to these ranks (For more information see Section VI.E1 and E2).

A4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be made for up to three years. The letter of offer will be used during the review process to evaluate the faculty's accomplishments in relation to the agreed upon criteria of the appointment. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

4a. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty of equivalent rank. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments are uncompensated. After consultation with and recommendation by the FAC, adjunct faculty appointments may be given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure), and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track and clinical faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

4b. Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment of tenure-track titles at 49% FTE or below. Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1 – 49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

4c. Lecturer. Lecturer appointments are compensated. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

4d. Senior Lecturer. Senior Lecturer appointments are compensated. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have a terminal degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.

4e. Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

A5. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-36. Full-time tenure track, clinical, research, or associated

faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Retiring faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-05-04, emeritus status will not be considered. After consultation with the FAC, the chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

A6. Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

A7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current university rank, with promotion in rank recognized. The department chair will prepare a letter of appointment that states the terms of the appointment. The letter of appointment will be used as the criteria for reappointment (see section V.C.9). Faculty with courtesy appointments do not participate in the CEF or have voting rights for departmental decisions.

B. Procedures for Appointment

The goals of successful faculty searches are to enhance the collective scientific or medical expertise of the departmental faculty and to increase the faculty's abilities to address the mission of the department within the context of the college and university missions. The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed. The department chair will initiate faculty searches after consultation with the faculty and the dean.

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

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

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

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

B1. Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within and outside of the department. Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the EEO training identified in the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

The SHIFT Framework serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising

and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified, talent pools to ensure alignment with the university's commitment to fair Employment Opportunity principles and advance the eminence of the institution.

- "Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants" focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency, and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- "Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations" provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the department chair.
- "Phase 4 | Extend Offer" provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- "Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard" offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- "Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search" is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

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

If the offer involves senior rank (associate professor or professor) or involves appointment with tenure, the department chair will solicit a formal vote by the CEF to determine the appropriateness of the proposed rank and the appropriateness of prior service credit. The CEF provides a written summary of its vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank and prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

The department will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

B2. Clinical Faculty

Searches for clinical faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interview will discuss scholarship but emphasize clinical/professional practice.

B3. Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the interview the candidate will emphasize research and scholarship.

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

B4. Transfer from the Tenure Track

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

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

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

B5. TIU Transfer

Following consultation with the department chair and college dean(s), a tenure-track faculty member may voluntarily move from one TIU to another upon approval of a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

The Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

B6. Associated Faculty

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with the FAC.

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

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

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

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

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

B7. Joint Appointments

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.5. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An [MOU](#) signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

B8. Courtesy Appointment for Faculty

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

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

A. Introduction

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals for which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and

- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, the chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

In all cases, accountability for the annual review process resides with the department chair.

Annual reviews will be based on the faculty's accomplishments during the calendar year.

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities (See Departmental [Pattern of Administration](#) section X. Faculty Duties, Responsibilities, and Workload); on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. For probationary faculty the annual review will be used as one source of information during the evaluation for annual reappointment, contract renewal, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

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

B. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than the last day of February.

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- Updated CV (*all faculty*)
- Peer evaluations of teaching as required by rank

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual performance and merit review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.

C. Procedures for Annual Review

C1. Initiation of the Annual Review Process

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

C2. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

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

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

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

C3. Fourth-Year Review of Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

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

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

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

For faculty with a joint appointment in another OSU TIU, the review will be conducted by the CEF of the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50%, and the material reviewed will include annual reviews from the joint appointment chair.

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

The review at the college level for the fourth year renewal will be conducted as described in the college pattern of administration and appointment, promotion and tenure documents. The dean will make the

final decision on each case. Reporting the results of these decisions and the opportunity for the probationary faculty to comment will follow the process described for promotion and tenure.

C4. Extension of the Tenure Clock

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (E) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C5. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

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

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

C6. Annual Review of Clinical Faculty

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

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

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for contract renewal will be performed by the chair. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. Reappointment requires satisfactory fulfillment of

contractual obligations as defined in the letter of offer and supportive annual reviews by the chair. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

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

C7. Annual Review of Research Faculty

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

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

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

C8. Annual Review of Associated and Courtesy Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals.

The department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

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

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

D. Salary Recommendations

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

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

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in the department. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

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

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

As a unit of the Ohio State University, the Department of Veterinary Biosciences is dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge, and candidates for promotion are expected to have demonstrated academic excellence in scholarship, teaching, and professional service.

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

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

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations. Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to all ideas and opinions.

A1. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

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

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. 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 is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically.

Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their current and future responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be teaching veterinary medical students, then excellence in veterinary medical student teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

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

The level of accomplishment (i.e., excellence, regional reputation, national reputation, and/or leadership) attained in each mission area shall be judged as the highest level at which a candidate demonstrates a sustained pattern of activity. 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. Following are examples of what the faculty member is expected to have achieved in teaching, scholarship, clinical service, and administrative service:

TEACHING	
Criteria	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of accomplishment	
Provided effective classroom instruction	• Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm • 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 • Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
Engaged in graduate education	• Served as primary research advisor to graduate students and postdoctoral trainees in the department or at the university in faculty member's area(s) of expertise
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	• Student evaluations of teaching scores and peer evaluations reflect growth in areas of reported deficiencies • Consistently excellent SEI scores and peer evaluations of teaching • Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment aligned with best practices in teaching • Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs • Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching
Evidence of excellence and reputation in teaching	
Demonstrated excellence in classroom instruction	• Consistently excellent student and peer evaluations of instruction
Demonstrated excellence in graduate education	• Served as primary advisor to MS or PhD students who have successfully completed their degree

Research	
Criteria	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of accomplishment	
Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused	• Has publications that contribute substantively to knowledge in the faculty area of focus • Has publications that begin to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others <i>The following attributes of the body of work are considered:</i> ○ <i>quality, impact, quantity</i>

	○ <i>unique contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work</i> ○ <i>rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues</i> ○ <i>(Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and original works more than edited works.)</i> ○ <i>empirical work (i.e., creating new knowledge), demonstrating the candidate's ability to conduct such work and to mentor future scholars, is preferred to synthetic work (i.e., synthesis of existing knowledge) at this stage of career</i> • Intellectually contributed to collaborative work (essential to some types of inquiry) <i>The candidate's intellectual contributions must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.</i>
Demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding.	• Obtained competitive extramural peer-reviewed funding as they serve as a quality indicator of research programs • Obtained multi-year grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity ○ <i>Grants and contracts that largely dictate the work to be done are weighted less heavily</i> ○ <i>Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review.</i> • Served as primary advisor to trainees who obtained external or intramural funding
Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research	• Full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program • Ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators
Evidence of excellence and reputation	
Evidence of developing national/international scientific reputation in the candidate's field	• Invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, • Invitations to review research papers and grant proposals • A beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications • Positive feedback from external evaluations

Service	
Criteria	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of accomplishment	
Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department	• Served on department, college or university committees • Regular and active participation in meetings in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others
Evidence of excellence and reputation	

Made contributions as leader on committees	- Served as chair or official in department, college or university committees - Led effort to reorganize or create committee or contributed substantially to existing committee
--	--

A2. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

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

*Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a **sustained record** of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.*

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

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

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments, and (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions. Promotion to professor should be awarded to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service.

The level of accomplishment attained in each mission area shall be judged as the highest level at which a candidate demonstrates a sustained pattern of activity since the last promotion.

In addition to the criteria indicated above for promotion to the rank of associate professor, below are examples of additional milestones considered for promotion to the rank of professor:

TEACHING	
Criteria: Evidence of reputation and Leadership	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Sustained excellence in classroom instruction	- Teaching regularly in multiple courses - Sustained record of excellent student and peer evaluations of instruction - Earning university teaching recognition/award, or multiple college recognitions/awards (<i>However, awards are not an expectation</i>)
Sustained excellence and leadership in graduate education	- Sustained record of advising/mentoring PhD students - Developing a training program - Sustained record of mentoring junior faculty

Research	
Criteria: Evidence of reputation and leadership	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met

Sustained excellence in research and scholarship	• Sustained record of publications as senior or first author in leading journals • Sustained record of extramural funding as PI, project leader, program director, and/or core leader • Recipient of multiple lecture invitations nationally and/or internationally • Invited research presentations at national and international scientific meetings • Local/national/international scientific award(s) • Achieved scientific inventions and acquired patents
--	--

Service	
Criteria: Evidence of reputation and Leadership	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Sustained excellence in service	• Chaired major university and/or college committees • Multiple lecture invitations, nationally and/or internationally • Received service award from national/international professional societies • Chaired national/international review committees

B. Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Faculty

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

B1. Promotion to the Rank of Clinical Assistant Professor

For promotion to assistant clinical professor from the rank of instructor, a faculty member must complete a doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service. Promotion will entail generating a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

B2. Promotion to the Rank of Clinical Associate Professor

For promotion to associate clinical professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence that they have achieved excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective up-to-date clinical service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice recognized at the local and/or regional level; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and administrative service for promotion to clinical associate professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Scholarship is an expectation and is characterized as contributing to a body of knowledge and disseminating knowledge. Scholarship will be evaluated commensurate with the percent effort outlined in the letter of offer and annual reviews. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

For promotion to associate clinical professor, following are examples of what the faculty member is expected to have achieved in teaching, scholarship, clinical service, and administrative service:

TEACHING	
Criteria	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of accomplishment	
Provided effective classroom instruction	- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm - 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 - provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge - A documented record of effective teaching that includes student and peer evaluations of clinical and didactic teaching.
Engaged in graduate education and residency training	- Served on advisory committees of graduate students in the department in faculty member's area(s) of expertise - Engaged in residency training in an appropriate discipline
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	- SEI scores and peer evaluations reflect growth in areas of reported deficiencies - Consistently excellent SEI scores and peer evaluations - Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment - Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs - Engaged in continuing education for teaching - Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching
Evidence of excellence and reputation in teaching	
Demonstrated excellence in classroom instruction	Consistently excellent student and peer evaluations of instruction A documented record of effective teaching that includes student and peer evaluations of clinical and didactic teaching
Demonstrated excellence in graduate education	Consistent service on graduate advisory committees

Scholarship	
Criteria	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of accomplishment	
	Has publications related to the clinical specialty in professional peer-reviewed journals

Author of publications related to the clinical specialty	- Has publications that reflect collaborative research support (e.g., pathology support for a study) - Has published book chapters
Author of publications that focus on the scholarship of teaching	Peer-reviewed publications that focus on the scholarship of teaching
Funded scholarship	Co-investigator on competitive peer- reviewed funding
Evidence of excellence and reputation	
Evidence of developing national/international scientific reputation in the candidate's field	- Delivered presentations at national meetings - Delivered invited presentations that draw from expertise in the clinical specialty and/or area of scholarship * Co-investigator or principal investigator on competitive peer- reviewed funding <i>(*However, acquisition of funding as principal investigator is not a requirement for promotion)</i>

Service	
Criteria	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of accomplishment	
Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department	- Served on department, college or university committees - Regular and active participation in meetings in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others
Evidence of excellence and reputation	
Made contributions as leader on committee	- Served as chair or official in department, college or university committees - Led effort to reorganize or create committee

Clinical Practice	
Criteria	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of accomplishment	
Made substantive contributions to the clinical service	- Provided timely and reliable state-of-the-art clinical service or expert service in area of expertise - Obtained positive feedback from stakeholders - Demonstrated evidence of commitment to professional specialty by involvement with societies relevant to the clinical specialty (i.e., membership, committee work, society officer)
Evidence of excellence and reputation	

Made contributions to the advancement of the clinical discipline	• Scholarship in discipline to include authorship or coauthorship, invited presentations, and/or participation in specialty college panels and/or, boards relevant and advancing the specialty field • Developed a local and national reputation among peers for excellence in discipline or area of expertise • Scientific contribution related to area of expertise • Hosting specialty seminars or chairing sessions at National/international meetings
--	---

C3. Promotion to the Rank of Clinical Professor

For promotion to the rank of clinical professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; recognized leadership and reputation in their professional specialty at the national or international level; leadership in service to the department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to the rank of professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

The level of accomplishment attained in each mission area shall be judged as the highest level at which a candidate demonstrates a sustained pattern of activity since the last promotion.

In addition to the criteria indicated above for promotion to the rank of associate clinical professor, below are examples of additional milestones considered for promotion to the rank of clinical professor:

TEACHING	
Criteria:	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of reputation and leadership	
Sustained excellence in classroom instruction	• Teaching regularly in multiple courses • Sustained record of excellent student and peer evaluations of instruction • Sustained record of effective teaching that includes student and peer evaluations of clinical and didactic teaching • Earning a university teaching recognition/award or multiple college recognitions/awards (<i>However, awards are not an expectation</i>)
Sustained excellence and leadership in graduate and residency training	• Sustained record of mentoring graduate students • Maintained excellence for existing training program

Scholarship	
Criteria:	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of reputation and leadership	
	• Continued publications in professional peer-reviewed journals of papers related to clinical specialty of the faculty

Sustained excellence in research and scholarship	• Continuous publication record that reflects collaborative research support • Continuous publications that focus on the scholarship of teaching • National or international scientific award(s) recognizing the faculty impact in advancing their clinical specialty • *Principal investigator or Co-investigator on competitive peer-reviewed funding (<i>*However, acquisition of funding as principal investigator is not a requirement for promotion</i>)
--	---

Service	
Criteria:	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of reputation and leadership	
Sustained excellence in service	• Chaired major university and/or college committees • Served as chair or leader of regional or national specialty or professional organization committees • Received multiple lecture/invited speaker invitations, nationally and/or internationally • Received service award from national/international professional societies or national specialty-related committees (<i>However, awards are not an expectation</i>)

Clinical Practice	
Criteria:	Example of evidence demonstrating that criteria has been met
Evidence of reputation and leadership	
Sustained excellence in Clinical Practice	• Provided sustained, timely, and reliable state-of-the-art clinical service or expert service in area of expertise • Leading/developing university-wide center related to the clinical specialty of the faculty • Key editorial role in leading specialty journal(s) • Received major institutional recognition(s) or award(s) (<i>However, awards are not an expectation</i>)

E. Criteria for Promotion of Research Faculty

E1. Promotion to the Rank of Research Associate Professor

For promotion to the rank of research associate professor, a faculty must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications and other works must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. Specific criteria for scholarship for promotion to the rank of associate professor are similar to those for promotion of tenure-track faculty. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

E2. Promotion to the Rank of Research Professor

For promotion to rank of research professor, a faculty must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A

record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Specific criteria for scholarship for promotion to the rank of professor are similar to those for tenure-track faculty. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

F. Criteria for Promotion of Associated Faculty

Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor. The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50%. The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.5.

Promotion of Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

G. Review Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure

G1. Procedures for Tenure-Track, Clinical, and Research Faculty

The department's procedures for reviewing actions for promotion and/or tenure are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

G2. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates seeking non-mandatory review must indicate their interest, in writing (e.g. email) to the department chair by April 1 of the year in which they seek to be reviewed. The department chair will notify the chair of the CEF.

In addition to developing a timeline for a promotion seminar, candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these latter three elements is described in detail below.

Dossier

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#). The chair will aid by providing relevant materials. These will include: the annual reviews letters (from the chair), a summary of the external evaluators contacted (from the chair), sample of chair's letter sent to external evaluators (from the chair), summary of comments of student evaluations (candidate obtains from Professional Programs), evaluations of teaching from veterinary medical students (for didactic lectures/laboratories and clinical rotations), graduate students and residents, peer evaluations of teaching and evaluations from stakeholders of clinical services. For faculty with a joint appointment in another OSU TIU, the material will include annual

reviews letters from the joint appointment chair. All other materials are within the dossier and are the responsibility of the candidate. While the CEF makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist. The candidate will consult with the POD to insure the completeness and accuracy of the dossier and additional materials prior to submission for review. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the documents to the POD with sufficient time for the review prior to the September 1 deadline or the June 1 deadline (see the Calendar for Mandatory and Non-mandatory Reviews of Faculty located in the Appendix).

Teaching

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Materials may include:

- Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar for classes external to those offered in the college.
- For those courses and rotations within the college
 - Summary table of student evaluation numerical data compiled by the candidate
 - Summary of student comments for courses and rotations in the professional program provided by Professional Programs
- evaluations by residents (One45)
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation guidelines (see section IX)
- copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - mentoring residents
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at local, national, and international conferences (with evaluations when available)
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges, universities, or professional groups (or sharing of teaching materials with such institutions or groups)
 - completion of teaching development programs
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

Scholarship

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion or reappointment may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

Materials may include:

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

Clinical Practice

The time period for clinical practice documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Materials may include:

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

Service

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it

believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Materials may include:

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

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

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document. Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of clinical and research faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available [here](#), a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

External Evaluations (see also External Evaluations below). Candidates are responsible to work with the department chair and the chair of the CEF to develop a list of external evaluators (see Section VI.I). A candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. A candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

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

G3. Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF) Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the CEF are as follows:

- Annually, to review this APT document and recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the current calendar year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place (see the Appendix for more on non-mandatory reviews). Candidates must self-identify, in writing to the department chair, by April 1. The eligible faculty for each candidate are defined as for all P&T actions. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's dossier and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04A(3) only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for non-probationary clinical and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful. Candidates are encouraged, but not required, to seek input from the CEF the following year.
 - A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, the CEF meets to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below. These actions need to be performed in the time frame described in the Calendar for Mandatory and Non-mandatory Reviews of Faculty located in the Appendix.
 - The CEF will select from among its members a POD who will serve in this role for the following year. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The POD's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
 - The CEF will suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.I below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
 - The POD reviews the candidate's dossier in Interfolio for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements and works with the candidate to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - As necessary, the CEF chairperson should meet with each candidate to clarify issues regarding the preparation of the dossier or the review procedure. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - The CEF members will be given access to review material in Interfolio at least a week before the CEF meets.
 - The CEF chair must schedule a meeting for the committee to discuss the various actions.

- Each CEF member has the responsibility to review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- Each CEF member has the responsibility to attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote to recommend or not to recommend the action at hand.
- The administrative services sub-committee of the CEF will draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service based on the CEF's discussion. The draft will comment, as appropriate, on the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit. Each CEF member has the responsibility to review and provide any comments regarding the draft letter from the administrative services committee regarding the outcome of the review. The CEF will revise the document as necessary. The final CEF recommendation will be signed by each member of the administrative services sub-committee. The final CEF recommendation letter will include the summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting that include the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and/or service, the consensus or disparity of opinion in these areas, and the faculty vote. The final CEF recommendation letter will be forwarded to the department chairperson as well as members of the CEF. The final CEF recommendation letter will be included in the dossier.
- If the candidate chooses to respond to the department's review, the chair of the CEF will provide the candidate's response to each member of the CEF. Each CEF member has the right to provide responses to the CEF chair. The administrative services sub-committee will summarize these comments and provide a written response on behalf of the CEF to any candidate comments that warrant response. This response will be included in the dossier.
- The administrative services sub-committee will also provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. 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.

G4. Department Chairperson Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Will determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.
- Will solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the CEF, the chair, and the candidate. (see section VI.I)
- Will review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty

duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

- Will make each candidate's dossier and other relevant documents available for review through the CEF chairperson at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- Will charge each member of the CEF to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- Will remove any member of the CEF from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review
- Will attend CEF meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed in order to best understand the points of deliberation as a non-voting participant.
- Will provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate in Interfolio, following receipt of the CEF's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- Will meet with the CEF to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the CEF.
- According to University Faculty Rule [3335-6-04\(B\)\(5\) and 3335-6-04©\(2\)](#), after completion of the department review process, the candidate will be notified of the availability of the evaluations by the CEF and department chair and the candidate's right to inspect these documents in Interfolio and if desired provide the chairperson with comments to either the CEF's or chair's letters within ten days for inclusion in the dossier. The candidate will upload a document into Interfolio indicating that they do or do not have comments.
- May provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- Will inform the Dean that the review has been completed in Interfolio by the deadline
- Will receive a notice of completion of CEF evaluation and recommendation in Interforlio for candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the chair's own independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

H. Procedures for Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.G.1 above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

I. External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs:

- Pathobiology, Biosciences or similar department in AVMA Accredited college or school of veterinary medicine in the United States. Examples include:
 - Department of Pathobiology at the University of Pennsylvania, School of Veterinary Medicine
 - Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Cornell University, College of Veterinary Medicine
 - Department of Pathology, Microbiology and Immunology, UC Davis, School of Veterinary Medicine
 - Department of Microbiology, Immunology, and Pathology, Colorado State University, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
 - Department of Population Health and Pathobiology, NC State University, College of Veterinary Medicine
 - Department of Biomedical Sciences, Oregon State University, Carlson College of Veterinary Medicine
- Department of Microbiology and Immunology or similar departments in top universities in the United States.

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is not from programs similar to those mentioned above.

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

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer's objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. In general, this department will only solicit evaluations from faculty at institutions in the programs listed above or similar institutions. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, or in cases of niche and/or emerging focus areas, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory or descriptive. The chairperson's letter requesting an evaluation should ask the evaluator to refrain from judging the candidate according to the criteria of his or her institution.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited as described in section VI.G4.

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for clinical faculty can be found [here](#).

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

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

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of clinical or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

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

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

VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

Courses listed in the College of Veterinary Medicine are electronically evaluated by the Office of Professional Programs Support (PPS). Student evaluations will be performed for all core and elective (currently opt-in) courses in accordance with PPS procedures and accepted guidelines on recommended responses rate as function of class size. The evaluations of teaching are performed toward the end of semesters or at the conclusion of specific clinical rotations. PPS staff prepare summaries of the student's numeric responses that are sent to the faculty. The output from these evaluations that should be saved for annual reviews, contract renewals, promotions, and tenure decisions. This is the responsibility of the faculty member.

When requested for promotion and tenure decisions, the PPS staff will prepare summaries of the comments provided by the students using the standard college process. This is the responsibility of the department chair.

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

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

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

For the purpose of faculty evaluation during annual review or promotion/reappointment, peer evaluations of teaching have to be summative (an evaluation of the effectiveness of the instruction) with the inclusion of evaluative comments. Peer reviews will be performed for all faculty that perform instruction. During the discussion of teaching assignments at the annual review, the department chair assigns one or more peer reviewers to evaluate the faculty's instruction in specific teaching assignments during the coming year. It is the responsibility of the department chair to identify the peer reviewer and share the assignments with both the faculty and peer reviewer.

For probationary tenure-track, clinical, and associated faculty and all assistant professors, a minimum of one summative peer evaluation/year is expected.

Tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate clinical professors are reviewed at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the

faculty member is assigned over a six-year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.

Faculty at the rank of tenured professor and non-probationary clinical professor have to obtain one peer review every other year.

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

The department chair may request a review of the teaching of any faculty member not scheduled for review if there are concerns triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

The teaching of a faculty member not scheduled for review may also be reviewed, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

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

Appendix:

Overview of the Roles of the CEF, Chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Dean in Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

Mandatory and Non-mandatory Reviews

Mandatory reviews are required in the last year of a probationary appointment or contract and include tenure track faculty at the rank of assistant professor and tenure track faculty initially appointed without tenure. Review of faculty for promotion at other times is non-mandatory. Non-mandatory review is initiated by the faculty after consultation with the department chairperson and faculty mentors. Those seeking non-mandatory reviews must declare, in writing, by April 1 to the department chair. The CEF reviews these requests in the spring.

Non-mandatory Reviews Process

A core dossier, CV, annual reviews, summary table of numerical student evaluations, and peer evaluations of teaching evaluations for the last 5 years or since last promotion of the faculty member initiating a non-mandatory review will be provided to the CEF chair. The CEF chair will identify the appropriate membership for the CEF and provide these faculty with the annual review documents for evaluation and a ballot indicating the CEF members will vote whether or not they support the review to go forward. Each CEF member will evaluate the materials. If the documents *clearly* do not support consideration for promotion or sufficient information (e.g., available student and peer evaluations) is not contained within the dossier, the CEF member will respond with a negative vote and a statement of the shortcomings. The CEF chair will tally negative votes and if the number of votes is greater than one third of the CEF members, the review will be stopped. If a non-mandatory review is stopped the CEF chair will summarize the CEF comments and inform both the faculty requesting the review and the departmental chair the result of the vote and the summary.

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

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

Calendar for Mandatory and Non-mandatory Reviews of Faculty

Action	Time Frame	Responsible party
Notify department chair, in writing, regarding intent to see non-mandatory review	April 1	Faculty Candidate
Provide review documents to CEF chair (for non-mandatory review only)	June 1	Faculty Candidate
Complete identification of external reviewers	July 1	Department Chair/ Faculty Candidate/CEF
Requested receipt date of external letters of review	August 15	Department Chair
Complete and submit dossier materials	September 1	Faculty Candidate
Present VBS seminar	May 1 to Sept 1	Faculty Candidate
Complete CEF review	October 1	CEF/CEF Chair
Dept Chair Letter	October 15	
Inform the candidate of the results of the review	October 15	Department Chair
10 day comment period		
Complete department review	early November	Department Chair