

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Guidelines, Criteria and Procedures for the College of Pharmacy

College of Pharmacy
The Ohio State University
500 W. Twelfth Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This document is based upon and borrows from the following documents:

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

Document No. 1 acknowledged the following:

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

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT..... 2

CONTENTS 3

SUMMARY OF P&T PROCEDURES 6

I. PREAMBLE 7

II. COLLEGE MISSION..... 7

III. APPOINTMENTS..... 8

A. Criteria: Tenure Track Faculty 9

 1. Instructor 9

 2. Assistant Professor 9

 3. Professor or Associate Professor 9

B. Criteria: Regular Clinical Track Faculty 10

 1. Instructor 10

 2. Assistant Professor 10

 3. Professor or Associate Professor 10

C. Criteria: Regular Research Track Faculty 11

 1. Research Assistant Professor 11

 2. Research Professor or Research Associate Professor 12

D. Criteria: Auxiliary Faculty 12

 1. Non-Clinical Auxiliary Faculty 12

 2. Clinical Auxiliary Faculty 12

E. Criteria: Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty 13

F. Procedures: Tenure Track Faculty 13

G. Procedures: Regular Clinical Track Faculty..... 15

H. Procedures: Research Track Faculty..... 15

I. Procedures: Auxiliary Faculty 15

 1. Non-Clinical Auxiliary Faculty 15

 2. Clinical Auxiliary Faculty 16

J. Procedures: Courtesy Appointments 16

IV. ANNUAL REVIEWS 16

A. Procedures: Probationary Tenure Track Faculty 16

B. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Periods 19

C. Procedures: Tenured Faculty 20

D. Procedures: Regular Clinical Track Faculty 20

E. Procedures: Regular Research Track Faculty 20

F. Procedures: Other Reviews 21

V. MERIT SALARY INCREASE AND OTHER REWARDS 22

A. Criteria 22

B. Procedures 22

C. Documentation 22

VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION 23

A. Criteria: Tenure Track Faculty 23

 1. Teaching 23

 2. Research 23

 3. Pharmaceutical Care (if applicable) 24

 4. Service 24

 5. Criteria: Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor 24

 6. Criteria: Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. 24

 7. Criteria: Promotion to Professor. 25

B. Criteria: Regular Clinical Faculty 25

 1. Teaching 25

 2. Delivery of Pharmaceutical Care 25

 3. Scholarly and Creative Work 26

 4. Service 26

 6. Criteria: Promotion to Associate Professor 26

 7. Criteria: Promotion to Professor. 26

C: Criteria: Regular-Research Track Faculty 27

D. Procedures 27

1.0. Promotion and Tenure Committee 28

 1.1. Composition 28

1.2. Function	28
2.0. Review Procedure for Tenure Track Faculty.....	29
2.1. General Guidelines.....	29
2.2. Specific Guidelines.....	31
3.0. Review Procedure for Reappointment and/or Promotion of Regular Clinical Faculty.....	33
3.1. Summary of Procedures.....	33
3.2. Annual Activity Report.	33
3.3. Annual Reviews in the First Term of Appointment.....	34
3.4. Fourth Year Reviews in First or Subsequent Terms of Appointment.....	34
3.5. Reviews of Regular Clinical Faculty for Promotion.....	35
4.0. Review Procedure for Reappointment and/or Promotion of Regular Research Track Faculty	35
5.0. Review Procedure for Appointment and Promotion of Auxiliary Faculty ...	35
5.1. General Comments	35
5.2. Dossier	36
5.3. Review	36
E. Documentation.....	37
1.0. Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Review of Regular Faculty	37
1.1. Documentation Relative to Teaching.....	37
1.2. Research and Other Scholarship	39
1.3. Service and Professional Practice.....	40
1.4. Pharmaceutical Care (if applicable).....	41
2.0. Documentation for Reappointment and/or Promotion Review of Regular Clinical Faculty	41
2.1. Teaching.....	41
2.2. Delivery of Pharmaceutical Care	43
2.3. Scholarly Activity and Other Creative Work.....	43
2.4. Service	43
F. Procedures: Regular Research Track Faculty.....	44
G. Post Review Procedures.....	44
H. Appeals.....	45
I. Seventh Year Reviews	45
J. Revision	46
APPENDIX.....	47

Summary of P&T Procedures

Candidate (by August 1)

- prepares dossier according to current OAA guidelines.
- prepares CV.
- prepares copies of cover page of all publications and of all grant award notices.
- selects the names of 4 external reviewers for evaluation of scholarship (except 4th year review) and submits them to division chair.
- after completion of the review by the dean (November-December), may provide within 10 days written comments for inclusion in the dossier.

Chair of Division

- meets with eligible division faculty around August 1 to review external evaluator names submitted by candidate; chair proposes names of six additional external evaluators; a majority of faculty should approve the list of external evaluators. The chair reviews the list of evaluators with the dean.
- solicits external letters of evaluation of scholarship, to be received by September 15.
- by October 10, prepares a written evaluation of the candidate with input from all eligible division faculty. The evaluation and faculty input should be informed by the dossier, CV, external letters of evaluation, and by relevant annual review and fourth-year review evaluations.
- dossier, CV, external letters, division chair's letter are forwarded to the P&T committee by October 10.

P&T Committee (1 tenured professor from each division, elected by division faculty).

- by June 30 notifies faculty of August 1 deadline for submission of applications.
- reviews application package for completeness, accuracy, conformation to guidelines.
- coordinates with support from the dean's office the review of application packages by all eligible members of the college faculty (October 15-November 1).
- convenes a "ballot meeting" of eligible faculty around Nov. 1; presents each case to the faculty for discussion.
- eligible faculty vote to approve or disapprove each case at the meeting; the committee conducts the balloting.
- the committee conveys the faculty vote and summarizes the deliberations of the faculty in a letter to the dean.
- may respond in writing to the written comments of the candidate on the review.

Dean

- prepares a written assessment of each case and a recommendation to approve or disapprove.
- notifies the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review.
- may respond in writing to the written comments of the candidate on the review.
- forwards the application to OAA.

I. PREAMBLE

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

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the provost of the university before it can be implemented. It sets forth the mission of the college and, in the context of that mission and the mission of the university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document the dean and provost accept the mission and criteria of the college and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

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

3335-6-01 General considerations.

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

II. COLLEGE MISSION

The overall mission of this college is to provide high quality education in the pharmaceutical sciences and pharmacy practice to professional, undergraduate,

graduate, and postgraduate students through its teaching, research, and related service activities. The goals listed here are not viewed to be of equivalent importance in contributing to the overall mission of the college nor deserving of an equivalent commitment of college resources. In accomplishing its goals, the college is committed to achieve and maintain a culturally diverse and pluralistic student body, faculty, and staff.

A. Teaching:

- To provide instruction and experiences for the development of skills in the pharmaceutical sciences and a foundation and background in the chemical, physical and biological sciences.
- To prepare students to comprehend and utilize emerging future technologies and provide instruction and experiences required for the skills needed for the practice of pharmacy of the highest quality.
- To promote the development of a pharmacy graduate with a highly developed sense of ethics and professional character and provide a broad background in and appreciation of the liberal arts.
- To promote instruction and experiences that encourage creativity and innovation and that motivate students to learn for the present and for a lifetime.

B. Research:

- To discover new knowledge, develop new technology and to disseminate new knowledge.

C. Service:

- To contribute to the College of Pharmacy and The Ohio State University; to contribute to public health knowledge; to support pharmacy practice and its practitioners and contribute to the pharmaceutical and health care sectors of society.

III. APPOINTMENTS

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

A. Criteria: Tenure Track Faculty**1. Instructor**

An appointment to the rank of instructor should normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. The appointment is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit will be granted for time spent as an instructor unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of the promotion that he or she does not wish such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the office of academic affairs through the dean of the college so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.

2. Assistant Professor

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

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. Regular tenured faculty appointments may only be terminated for cause or financial exigency (see rules 3335-5-04 and 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code).

3. Professor or Associate Professor

An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure, unless the office of academic affairs approves a probationary period. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the provost. For appointment as associate professor, the candidate should have achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service. The potential to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the college of pharmacy should also be apparent. For appointment as professor, the candidate should have achieved a sustained record of excellence in teaching, produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally, and demonstrated leadership in service.

B. Criteria: Regular Clinical Track Faculty

The initial appointment for regular clinical faculty is always probationary. By the end of the second to final year of the probationary appointment, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, regular clinical faculty appointments may only be terminated for cause or financial exigency (see rules 3335-5-04 and 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code).

1. Instructor

An appointment to the rank of instructor should normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. The appointment to the rank of instructor may not exceed three years. An instructor must have completed the required terminal degree by the beginning of the fourth year of appointment or the appointment will terminate at the end of the fourth year.

2. Assistant Professor

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

3. Professor or Associate Professor

The minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of associate professor of clinical pharmacy is an earned doctorate or equivalent experience, and evidence of developing and maintaining excellence in the delivery of pharmaceutical care, evidence of teaching excellence, evidence of scholarship, and demonstrated potential for provision of effective service, and an ability to progress through the ranks. The minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of professor of clinical pharmacy is an earned doctorate or equivalent experience, a sustained record of excellence in the delivery of pharmaceutical care and in teaching, provision of a body of scholarship that is recognized by peers, and demonstrated leadership in service. Appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the office of academic affairs.

C. Criteria: Regular Research Track Faculty

1. Research Assistant Professor

The titles of regular research-track (non-tenure accruing) faculty who are appointed at 50% or more in the College of Pharmacy are: Research Assistant Professor of Pharmacy, Research Associate Professor of Pharmacy, and Research Professor of Pharmacy. Individuals in the regular research track have responsibilities primarily in research related to the mission and goals of the College. The University

rules concerning appointment, non-reappointment, and promotion of regular research track faculty are described in Faculty Rule 3335-7.

Criteria for appointment in regular research-track faculty positions emphasize accomplishments and potential in research and scholarship. Persons in the research track may engage in limited educational activities, but classroom teaching cannot be a required part of the workload. In addition, regular research-track faculty must not be engaged continuously in the same instructional activities as regular tenure-track faculty.

Regular research track faculty may engage in independent research or in collaborative research with others, including the development of extramural sources of salary support. However, persons appointed to the regular research track are expected to develop extramural support for 100% of their salary. The specific time frame within which this must be accomplished, and the degree to which failure to attain such support, will affect either the renewal of the appointment or the individual's salary, and will be stated clearly in the contract for the position.

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

The procedures for the appointment of a Research Assistant Professor will be identical to those for a regular tenure-track Assistant Professor. Research Assistant Professors are considered probationary. Contracts must be for at least one year and no more than five years.

2. Research Associate Professor and Research Professor

An appointment as research associate professor or research professor will not involve the award of tenure. All appointments at these levels require prior approval of the provost. For appointment at the level of Research Associate Professor, the minimum requirement is an earned doctorate or equivalent experience and evidence of the attainment of excellence in research and scholarship, with the potential to continue an independent program of high quality relevant to the mission of the college of pharmacy. For appointment at the level of Research Professor, the candidate should have achieved as sustained record of excellence in research and scholarship, as recognized nationally and internationally.

D. Criteria: Auxiliary Faculty

The college may make auxiliary appointments to faculty who provide significant resources in teaching and service. Appointment carries the expectation for contributions to the college. Appointment may or may not involve payment of a salary. No-salary auxiliary faculty include adjunct faculty and faculty with regular titles at zero percent time (such as Cleveland Clinic Foundation appointments). They may also include visiting faculty and auxiliary clinical faculty. No-salary appointments are not warranted unless they are accompanied by substantial involvement by the appointee in the academic work of the college. These are not tenured or tenure-track appointments. Auxiliary appointments may be made for only one year at a time and thus require formal annual renewal if they are to be continued. Auxiliary appointments in the College of Pharmacy include the following:

1. Non-Clinical Auxiliary Faculty.

The criteria for appointment to the auxiliary faculty with modified faculty titles (such as *adjunct* and *visiting*) are comparable to the criteria for appointment at the regular ranks. These criteria will also serve as a basis for evaluation of the occasional auxiliary faculty member who desires promotion. Candidates should hold appropriate advanced degrees or have sufficient experience to provide excellent service to the college. Visiting and adjunct faculty are eligible to teach at any level for which they are qualified as scholars and teachers. Such appointments will be made by the dean upon approval by a majority of the regular faculty of the division in which the candidate will be appointed and the executive committee. Visiting and adjunct faculty appointments typically take advantage of opportunities and are not the result of a search. Visiting faculty, whose appointments may not exceed three continuous years, include individuals on leave from other academic institutions and temporary faculty.

The minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of lecturer will be that all work for the Ph.D. except the dissertation be completed at the time of the appointment. Lecturers will be appointed by the dean upon approval by a majority of the regular faculty of the division in which the candidate will be appointed and the executive committee. Their appointments will be made on a course-by-course and quarter-by-quarter basis. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and by the division chair or his or her designee. Lecturers may be reappointed if there is a continuing need for their services and if their teaching has been effective.

2. Clinical Auxiliary Faculty.

The general criteria for appointment are: a sincere interest in teaching, specifically the teaching and nurturing of pharmacy students; a baccalaureate or advanced degree in one of the health sciences; if the candidate is a pharmacist, he or she must meet the Ohio Administrative Code definition of preceptor; at least one year of experience as a licensed practitioner in a health care-related practice subsequent to receiving an entry-level degree; willingness to positively support the teaching mission of the college; willingness to participate in experiential teaching when available, as requested by the Director of Professional Experience Programs; demonstrated desire for professional growth and advancement of the profession, e.g., by active participation in local, state

and/or national pharmacy organizations, and tangible evidence of interest in maintenance of professional competence.

- 2.a. Clinical Instructor.** A candidate for appointment must meet all of the minimum criteria for appointment as an auxiliary faculty member of The Ohio State University College of Pharmacy.
- 2.b. Clinical Assistant Professor.** A candidate for appointment must meet all of the criteria for appointment at the rank of Clinical Instructor, and must have at least one year of post-entry level teaching and clinical experience. In addition, the candidate must meet at least one of the following criteria: a) Completion of a post-entry level degree training program, or the equivalent. b) Verified service to the pharmacy profession. c) Verified scholarly activity.
- 2.c. Clinical Associate Professor.** A candidate for appointment must meet all of the criteria for appointment at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor, must have 5-10 years post-entry level teaching and clinical experience, and must meet at least one of the following criteria: a) Substantial teaching. b) Substantial service to the pharmacy profession. c) Substantial scholarly activity.
- 2.d. Clinical Professor.** A candidate for appointment must meet all of the criteria for appointment at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, must have at least 10 years post-entry level teaching and clinical experience, and must meet at least one of the following criteria: a) Exceptional teaching. b) Exceptional service to the pharmacy profession. c) Exceptional scholarly activity.

E. Criteria: Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

A courtesy appointment is offered to an individual on appointment at Ohio State who could contribute to the academic, research or service mission of the college. A candidate for a courtesy appointment in the college must meet the criteria for appointment to the comparable regular or regular clinical title. Candidates will be appointed by the dean upon approval by a majority of the regular faculty of the division in which the candidate will be appointed. Courtesy faculty are re-appointed on an annual basis, if the contribution to the college continues. Unlike auxiliary appointments, courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal. Such an individual may hold graduate faculty status in the college, upon the recommendation of the graduate and research committee. Courtesy faculty may collaborate with regular and regular clinical faculty in graduate and undergraduate courses and may participate in program development.

F. Procedures: Tenure Track Faculty

After the dean has approved a search to fill a tenure track position, the division faculty will approve a position description. The division chair will appoint a search committee, which will solicit applications broadly and by a variety of means, including advertisements in appropriate journals and newsletters of professional organizations, requests to colleagues asking for nominations, and invitations to potential highly qualified and desirable candidates. Special attention will be paid to the college diversity plan during the search to increase the numbers of qualified under-represented applicants. The search committee will solicit letters of evaluation from references

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

Appointment to the regular faculty ranks of professor or associate professor will generally, although not necessarily, entail tenure. A probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the office of academic affairs upon petition by dean. Whether the appointment will be with tenure or with a probationary period will be determined by the division chair and the dean, possibly in negotiation with the candidate. When the appointment does not include tenure or an increase in rank, the appointment may be made without an evaluation and vote of the eligible college faculty.

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

1. When the candidate will be appointed to a position analogous to that which he or she currently holds, e.g., a currently tenured associate professor is to be appointed as associate professor with tenure at Ohio State, the documentation may consist of the materials gathered during the selection process. The salient parts of the dossier core, as described in the most recent version of *Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure ...* (Office of Academic Affairs) should be present. These parts include a list of courses taught, teaching evaluations (student and peer as available), graduate students directed, a list of published work, and a list of current and past research funding. The candidate should supply any missing items. In addition to the letters of recommendation obtained as part of the selection process, the division chair may wish to obtain letters of evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work from appropriately qualified outside evaluators, who should be selected by the chair in consultation with eligible division faculty.
2. When the appointment is to a rank above that currently held by the candidate or when the appointment will be with tenure and the candidate is currently untenured, evaluation letters from at least six outside evaluators should be obtained. The candidate should prepare a dossier as described in the OAA's

- most recent version of *Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure....* It is recognized that in certain competitive circumstances it will be necessary to react rather quickly. The promotion and tenure committee should be consulted by the division chair and the dean regarding approaches that may be used to streamline the collection of documentation so that as much relevant information can be assembled in a time frame appropriate to the particular situation.
3. The division chair should prepare a letter that evaluates the quality of academic performance and effectiveness of the candidate in the defined area of faculty responsibilities; i.e., teaching, research, professional competence, and service. To assist the writing of the evaluation letter, the chair shall obtain input from all eligible regular division faculty members (including regular clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate in the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Administration when regular clinical faculty are considered). However, since each participant will have only one vote in the process, at the ballot meeting, no faculty votes are to be conducted at the division level.
 4. The documentation will be checked by the promotion and tenure committee to ensure that it contains the required information, meets with procedural requirements, and that publications and grants listed in the dossier have been verified.
 5. The documentation of the candidate will be made available to eligible faculty for at least five working days before a "ballot meeting" of eligible faculty is convened by the promotion and tenure committee. The meeting will be conducted as described in Section VI.
 6. The final tally for each candidate will be determined by the promotion and tenure committee and reported to the dean of the college of pharmacy in a letter from the committee. The committee's letter should also summarize the sense of the faculty and the rationale for the outcome of the vote. The letter should provide the eligible faculty's assessment of quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service.
 7. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require approval of the provost.

G. Procedures: Regular Clinical Track Faculty

The same procedure as described for tenure track faculty will be followed.

H. Procedures: Research Track Faculty

The same procedure as described for tenure track faculty will be followed.

I. Procedures: Auxiliary Faculty

1. Non-Clinical Auxiliary Faculty.

Appointment will be initiated at the division level. A candidate may be recommended to the division chair by a member of the division faculty or the candidate may request that he or she be considered for appointment. The division faculty must

approve the appointment by a simple majority vote, which may be preceded by an interview and seminar by the candidate. Upon approval by the division faculty and by the chair of the division, the candidate will be recommended to the dean for appointment. Auxiliary faculty are reviewed annually for reappointment. For reappointment, there should be a substantial involvement by the appointee in the academic work of the college. Division faculty should review annually the auxiliary faculty of the division. The appointment of faculty who cease to contribute substantially to the mission of the college should not be renewed. The decision not to renew an appointment requires a majority vote of the division faculty.

2. Clinical Auxiliary Faculty.

The candidate should submit a curriculum vitae along with either a written request for appointment or a letter of recommendation for appointment by the experiential site preceptor coordinator for the pharmacy site. The request for initial appointment should be sent to the director of professional experience programs. Initial appointment to titles of clinical instructor and clinical assistant professor require the approval of, and are processed by, the director. Approved candidates are recommended to the dean's designee for initial appointment. Appointments to clinical associate professor and clinical professor titles require approval by a majority of the faculty of the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Administration. Clinical faculty appointments are reviewed annually by the director. Reappointment requires that the appointee contributed during the previous calendar year to the teaching, patient care, scholarship, professional or public service activities of the division. In addition during the previous year, the appointee must have attended a minimum of one faculty teaching workshop or have completed a self-study continuing education module and submitted it to the director of professional experience programs.

J. Procedures: Courtesy Appointments

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

IV. ANNUAL REVIEWS

A. Procedures: Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

These procedures are consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 as well as with office of academic affairs policies described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and

Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook>). Below is relevant material from the Faculty Rules:

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members are provided with documents detailing the college and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members are provided with copies of the revised documents.

During a probationary period a faculty member shall be reviewed annually. The annual review should encompass the faculty member's performance in teaching, in scholarship, and in service; as well as evidence of continuing development. The involvement of tenure initiating unit faculty in annual reviews is strongly encouraged. The dean shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of the office of academic affairs dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. At the completion of the annual review the dean shall provide the faculty member with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The assessment should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. If the dean's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. A recommendation from the dean to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows Fourth Year Review procedures, and the dean shall make the final decision in the matter. All annual review letters to date become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

1. At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.
2. The chair and the tenured faculty of the division shall review all untenured faculty in each year of their probationary service. The annual review will encompass the untenured faculty member's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and will require evidence of continuing development in each area. External evaluations of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the tenured faculty or the division chair. The chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment and in a timely fashion each year thereafter when the annual review will take place. The annual review enables the college to communicate its performance expectations to probationary faculty and to evaluate progress towards those expectations. All annual review letters will become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.
3. Faculty under review are responsible for providing an appropriate faculty activity statement and appropriate materials for review. The office of academic affairs dossier outline must be used. The division chair and the tenured faculty may solicit or provide additional information which they consider relevant.
4. All tenured faculty of the division will be consulted during the annual review, either at a faculty meeting set for the review or through other means when any tenured faculty member cannot be present at the meeting. It is the chair's responsibility to contact all tenured faculty members and to solicit input from them. Any tenured

faculty who cannot attend the review meeting may submit input.¹ The chair will summarize the deliberations in the annual review letter to the candidate (see Appendix). Whenever the faculty evaluation is less than unanimous the chair will invite the submission of written dissenting opinions so that he or she may create one report to the dean, which covers all points of view.

5. The dean will review the candidate's activity statement and the annual review letter of the division chair. The dean may write a separate letter of evaluation of the candidate, or may endorse the letter from the division. The annual review of probationary faculty should be completed by the end of Summer Quarter. If the outcome of the annual review, other than the fourth year review, is negative and the dean decides that no renewal of the appointment is warranted, a formal performance review that employs fourth year review procedures will be undertaken during the ensuing Quarter, as set forth in section (VI)(C)(2) of this document. If the outcome of the formal performance review is negative, the case will be forwarded to the provost for review during the following January; the provost makes the final decision regarding reappointment. Notification of nonrenewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in 3335-6-08 of the University Faculty Rules. The fourth year review procedure subsequent to a non-renewal decision should be completed by the end of Summer Quarter that follows the annual review.
6. Regardless of the outcome, the candidate will be invited to review the letters of the division chair and the dean. The candidate may comment in writing on the letters and the review; comments must be submitted to the dean within ten working days of the invitation to review the letters. The division chair and the dean must respond in writing to the comments, within ten working days of their receipt, but the process ends there.
7. In cases of differing assessments when there is a recommendation for reappointment the dean will attempt to resolve conflicting evaluations in a way that both advises the faculty member of those areas where his or her record is open to question and provides candid and clear advice about aspects of performance that need improvement.
8. The dean will notify the probationary faculty member in writing of a decision for non-renewal and of university appeal procedures. The letter shall supply to the faculty member the reasons for non-renewal. When the dean's decision against renewal of the appointment opposes a recommendation by division or college faculty to renew the appointment, the dean shall explain his or her disagreement to the faculty in writing.
9. The fourth year review of probationary faculty follows the same process as the review for tenure and promotion with the exception that solicitation of external letters of evaluation shall be optional. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the dean of the

¹ Typically this will apply to faculty who are out of town or who cannot attend for various reasons. It is understood that faculty who can attend have a responsibility to participate fully in these discussions.

college. Because the college has only one level of review, all annual reviews of probationary faculty that lead to a nonrenewal decision are reviewed by the office of academic affairs and the provost is the final decision maker. The fourth year review of probationary faculty should be completed by the end of Winter Quarter and submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs by the January Deadline.

B. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Periods

(Adapted from Faculty Rule 3335-6-03)

1. An untenured regular faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the care giving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age 6. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period for this reason must be made within the year following the birth or adoption and prior to the beginning of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period for the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age 6 is one year. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted in writing to the dean and to the office of academic affairs. Such requests will be approved unless they are prohibited by paragraphs (3) or (4) of this rule.
2. A probationary faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful university faculty member; i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted in writing to the dean. Such requests require approval by the dean, and the provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to the beginning of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.
3. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a non-renewal notice has been issued, nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the university's right not to renew a probationary appointment.
4. The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period for any reason or combination of reasons is one year for an instructor, two years for an assistant professor, (including time spent as an instructor) and one year for an associate professor, except in extraordinary circumstances. Exceptions require the approval of the division chair, dean, and provost.
5. Faculty members will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period for any of the above

reasons, unless their absence from the campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical.

6. For purposes of performance reviews of probationary faculty, the length of the probationary period is the actual number of years of employment at this university less any years of service excluded from the probationary period under the terms of this rule. Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted under the terms of this rule.

C. Procedures: Tenured Faculty

Each year each member of the tenured faculty will provide the chair with a current vita and a Faculty Activity Statement summarizing recent professional activities. The college has a standard format for a curriculum vitae and an annual Faculty Activity Statement, that ensures comparability of these documents across the college. Copies of current faculty CV's are always available in an accessible location where any faculty member can review them. The chair will review these documents and will use them as the basis for an annual performance review of each tenured member of the division. The chair will provide each faculty member with written feedback regarding his/her performance and future plans. That review will enable the chair to highlight performance problems where they exist and to assist faculty in carrying out their professional plans. A tenured faculty member may request a meeting with the chair in order to discuss his or her review, and may respond in writing to the chair's performance evaluations. Annual reviews should be constructive and candid. The college is committed to using the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement.

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

D. Procedures: Regular Clinical Track Faculty

The annual review process for Regular Clinical Track faculty in their first term of appointment is parallel to that required for probationary tenure track faculty, and the review process for Regular Clinical Track faculty in their second and subsequent terms of appointment is parallel to that required for tenured faculty.

E. Procedures: Regular Research Track Faculty

The annual review process for research-track faculty in their first term of appointment is parallel to that required for probationary tenure-track faculty, but only research and scholarship will be evaluated. The expectations concerning publication are similar to those for tenure-track faculty in terms of scope and quality, but research-track faculty should have higher productivity. Because the appointment depends on success in external funding, this is an explicit review criterion. Excellence in gaining external

funding is measured both by the amount of funding and by the visibility and competitiveness of the sources.

The review process for regular research-track faculty in their second or subsequent terms of appointment is parallel to that required for tenured faculty, and will emphasize excellence in research. Faculty members are reviewed according to the promotion criteria for the rank they hold.

A review will occur in the next-to-last year of the probationary period and in the next-to-last year of each subsequent term of appointment for regular research track faculty. For these faculty members, a positive review of this type carries with it a reappointment to another term (of whatever length has been established, depending on the category and the contract).

In all other aspects, the review is conducted using the same procedures outlined in section IV.A above. However, in the case of a regular research track faculty member, a decision by the dean for non-reappointment is final. If the appointment is not renewed, standards of notice will be in accord with Faculty Rule 3335-6-08.

The annual review process for a regular research-track faculty member in the second and subsequent terms of appointment will be identical to that required for tenured faculty (i.e., an administrative review in the spring), except in the next-to-last term. During this specific year, the reviews are the same as those for promotion and tenure described in section VI below (Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion). For each positive recommendation in the next-to-last year, an original signed cover sheet (Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment) should be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs, but no letters, vita, or dossier are required.

F. Procedures: Other Reviews

1. If, at any time during the year, the dean finds it necessary to consider the contractual arrangements or continuation of service of any instructor, assistant professor, or associate professor, including tenure and/or promotion, he or she shall so inform all full professors in the division. If there are fewer than three full professors, the dean will appoint the requisite number of full professors from elsewhere in the college. This committee shall return a recommendation to the dean.
2. Assistant and associate professors may ask to be considered for non-mandatory tenure and promotion reviews at any time. The procedures are outlined under Section VI.
3. If during an annual review it is determined by a two-thirds vote of eligible faculty that an assistant professor should be put up for promotion and tenure before his or her probationary term is completed, the chair will invite that assistant professor to submit his or her dossier to the promotion and tenure committee for review and evaluation.

V. MERIT SALARY INCREASE AND OTHER REWARDS

A. Criteria

The annual performance evaluation described in Section IV will serve as the basis for the recommended annual salary increase. Unless the president directs otherwise, all money made available to the college for annual increments is distributed on the basis of merit in the categories of scholarship, teaching, pharmaceutical care (if applicable), and service. While quantitative measures are always useful, they will never be the sole criterion by which performance is measured. Performance in any area of research, teaching or service will be evaluated as a whole and will not be dependent upon any particular criteria. Merit in scholarship may be determined by such quantitative indicators as the number of publications, but must also be qualified by the standing of the journals and professional conferences that serve as outlets for scholarship, by the anonymous evaluations provided by the process of peer review, professional awards, prizes and recognition for work done, and finally the chair's judgment regarding the excellence and impact of the scholarship. Merit in teaching should consider the number and difficulty of courses and independent studies taught, the number and quality of graduate students directed, the number of students from other departments who seek out a particular faculty member, curricular innovation, and student evaluations. Merit in service is reflected in the committees on which a faculty member has served, and by such qualitative indicators as visibility as editor, member of editorial boards, leadership in scientific and professional societies, and excellent service on particularly time-consuming college committees. In making salary recommendations, the previous year's performance will normally be considered. When the money available is extraordinarily large, or after a period of extraordinarily small increments, the period considered may extend to the previous two or three years. Salary increases will never be based upon promises of forthcoming performance.

B. Procedures

The chair of each division will meet separately with the dean to discuss the annual performance evaluation of each faculty member in their division. The evaluation will be based on the Faculty Activity Statement submitted by each faculty member and an assessment of each faculty member's accomplishments in contributing to the college's mission. This discussion serves as the basis for the dean's annual salary recommendation. All money made available to the college for annual salary increases is distributed on the basis of merit in the categories of scholarship, teaching, pharmaceutical care (if applicable), and service, unless the president directs otherwise. The dean, in consultation with the chair, will determine the amount of recommended salary increase for each faculty member. The dean will forward the recommendation to the provost's office for concurrence. Final responsibility for all salary increases rests with the Board of Trustees.

C. Documentation

All faculty must complete the same Faculty Activity Statement. They are encouraged to include copies of the comments of referees, unsolicited letters from

students and alumni, and any other indicators of the quality and impact that the faculty member's work has had on others.

VI. Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (D):

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

A. Criteria: Tenure Track Faculty

1. Teaching

The college of pharmacy has a tradition of commitment to teaching and expects its faculty to contribute to this tradition. Effective teaching is an essential criterion for advancement. The following points, among others, should be considered in evaluating the candidate's effectiveness in teaching: knowledge, understanding, and presentation of the subject matter taught; necessary foundations, current developments, and major issues of the subject matter taught; appropriateness of the degree of difficulty of the material being presented, taking into consideration the level of and preparation of the students; application of contemporary teaching and learning techniques, appropriateness of course formats for the subject matter being taught; appropriateness of methods of assessing student learning; ability to organize material and to present it with logic and conviction; capacity to create in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject matter to more advanced material, to the study of related subjects, to other disciplines and/or to professional practice; objectivity; the creativity, spirit, and enthusiasm which invigorate the candidate's teaching; ability to arouse curiosity, stimulate creativity, and enhance learning among students; and the extent and skill of participation in the general guidance and advising of students. The candidate's contribution to the teaching mission of the college may also include the development of courses, curricula, practice sites, evaluation instruments, and innovative teaching materials and methods. Division chairs should provide candidates with a statement of "expectations about teaching" within their divisions. Such a statement should include: (a) typical teaching and advising loads, including number of courses per quarter, level of instruction, the nature of student clientele, and whether the courses are required or elective; and (b) differentiation of expectations by rank and responsibilities.

2. Research

The capability of being continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance is a basic requisite for maintaining and enhancing professional competence of any faculty member. Usually, the measures of quality and

quantity of published refereed research and other creative work are used as indicators of professional competence of the regular faculty member. In general, there should be evidence that the candidate is consistently and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance with an area of emphasis.

3. Pharmaceutical Care (if applicable)

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

4. Service

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

5. Criteria: Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor.

The candidate must have an appropriate doctoral degree, or equivalent education and experience, and have demonstrated potential for significant published contributions to scholarship in his or her field and ability as an effective teacher in the college.

6. Criteria: Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

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

7. Criteria: Promotion to Professor.

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

B. Criteria: Regular Clinical Faculty

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

1. Teaching

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

2. Delivery of Pharmaceutical Care

The development of the regular clinical candidate's practice and subsequent delivery of pharmaceutical care is a vital and substantial component of the candidate's responsibilities. Pharmaceutical care includes direct involvement with patients, both healthy and ill, in assuming joint responsibility for achieving optimal drug-related outcomes. Patient care requires the pharmacist to base some or all interventions on either consultation with the patient or an evaluation of patient-specific information. All regular clinical faculty members must be involved with the delivery of patient care,

(patient care includes activities associated with managed care). The regular clinical faculty member must demonstrate excellence in professional practice in the delivery of patient care. Care to the patient can be provided by students or residents under the direct supervision and guidance of the candidate. Candidates must demonstrate appropriate understanding of the disease state and patient assessment methods, must identify and manage the medication use process, and must be able to provide and document evidence-based, individualized pharmacotherapeutic interventions. Furthermore, the ability to communicate clearly and effectively with patients and prescribers must be demonstrated.

3. Scholarly and Creative Work

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

4. Service

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

5. Criteria: Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor.

The candidate must have a doctoral degree or equivalent education and experience. He or she must have demonstrated potential for development of a practice and subsequent delivery of pharmaceutical care, and ability as an effective teacher.

6. Criteria: Promotion to Associate Professor.

The college has no quantitative measure that either bars or guarantees promotion. To be eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, the candidate must provide convincing evidence that he or she has achieved, and is expected to continue to provide excellence in teaching and in the delivery of pharmaceutical care. The candidate must demonstrate scholarship, and must provide effective service. These criteria and the procedures for evaluation of performance are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

7. Criteria: Promotion to Professor.

The college expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. The candidate must have made scholarly contributions to his or her area of expertise. Promotion to professor must be based on convincing evidence that the candidate has: a sustained record of excellence in teaching and in provision of pharmaceutical care delivery, produced a body of scholarship that is recognized by peers, and demonstrates leadership in service. These criteria and the procedures for their evaluation are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

C: Criteria: Regular-Research Track Faculty

1. Research

The criteria are the same as described for the regular tenure-track faculty in section VI.A.3 above.

2. Criteria: Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor

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

3. Criteria: Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research-Professor

Promotion to the regular research faculty rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in research and scholarship that it recognized nationally and/or internationally, including a continual record of success in obtained external research funding from high-quality sources. Persons holding this rank should be clearly recognized as leaders in their field, whose presence substantially enhances the research program of the college, including the mentoring of others.

D. Procedures

Below is the portion of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 that provides general information on review procedures and describes tenure initiating unit review procedures:

3335-6-04 Promotion and tenure review procedures.

(A) General considerations.

(1) In consultation with the rules committee or its designee, the office of academic affairs shall develop and promulgate procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews to supplement chapter 6 of the rules of the university faculty. These guidelines shall include a dossier outline to be used for the documentation of accomplishments by all candidates to be reviewed for promotion and tenure and by all probationary faculty for annual reviews. The guidelines shall also include general information about the review process at the college and university level, information about any legal considerations affecting promotion and tenure evaluations, examples of criteria by which candidates for promotion and tenure are evaluated, and other information intended to assist academic units in carrying out reviews.

(2) All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed by the eligible faculty and by the chair of their tenure initiating unit. Candidates will also be reviewed at the college and university levels. The tenure initiating unit chair is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the board of trustees (if positive).

(3) The review for tenure during the final year of a probationary period is mandatory and must take place.

A faculty member may ask to be considered for nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The promotion and

tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.

(4) Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the tenure initiating unit chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the tenure initiating unit, the tenure initiating unit chair shall inform the dean or the provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.

1.0. Promotion and Tenure Committee

1.1. Composition

1.1.1. Election. The promotion and tenure committee is composed of four elected, tenured, full-time faculty members (of full-professor rank) from the college of pharmacy faculty. Each division shall elect one member of the committee; no member can represent more than one division. Members will be elected by June 30 of each year for a two-year term, with two members elected each year. Special elections will be conducted to fill vacancies. Deans are ineligible for membership in the promotion and tenure committee.

1.1.2. Selection of Chairperson. At its first meeting of the academic year the committee members will select a chair for the committee from its members.

1.2. Function

The Committee on Promotion and Tenure in the college of pharmacy has the following functions:

1. to serve as a coordinating committee for the dean in all matters relating to fourth year review, promotion in rank, and for the granting of tenure.
2. to review all nomination materials to assure that they are properly, accurately, and adequately documented to facilitate the completion of the promotion and/or tenure process.
3. to determine whether to put forth a tenure-track faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review.
4. to present candidates' applications to meetings of eligible faculty held to consider and vote on candidates for fourth-year review, promotion, and promotion with tenure.
5. to convey the vote of the eligible faculty to the dean along with a written summary of the deliberations of eligible faculty.
6. to review comments coming from the candidate related to fourth-year review, promotion, and promotion with tenure, and forward its response to the dean.
7. to initiate or review and recommend to the college faculty for action any changes to the standards, procedures, and guidelines outlined in this document.

2.0. Review Procedure for Tenure Track Faculty

2.1. General Guidelines

Nomination of Candidates and Documentation.

1. By June 30, the promotion and tenure committee shall remind all faculty in the college of pharmacy that the complete documentation in support of any candidate's fourth-year review, and tenure and/or promotion consideration be submitted by the chair of the division to the committee by October 10. No exceptions will be made. The format for presentation of the documentation is provided by the office of academic affairs. With the exception of mandatory reviews, the candidate may withdraw the application before November 15. Each application will be processed through all the procedural steps mandated by university policy.
2. The dean's office will provide a tenure audit list to the committee chair to assist the committee in identifying candidates who must submit applications for the fourth and sixth year review.
3. By August 1, the candidate should present to the division chair a dossier prepared according to the most recent guidelines from the office of academic affairs, a curriculum vitae which represents a concise but comprehensive summary of the candidate's accomplishments to date, and copies of five representative publications. The curriculum vitae and the copies of publications will be sent to outside evaluators. In addition, a photocopy of the title page of all other published works and of grant and contract award notices should be presented.
4. With the exception of the fourth-year review candidates, all other candidates for promotion and/or tenure consideration should submit by August 1 to the division chair the names of four outside evaluators (complete with current affiliation, address and telephone number).

The following guidelines should be observed by the candidate in terms of submission of names of outside evaluators and by the division chair in terms of obtaining letters of recommendation and evaluation from the "outside" and other evaluators for the candidate:

- a. "Outside" evaluators should consist of people outside the university.
- b. Letters from evaluators from outside the college of pharmacy but from other units of The Ohio State University (e.g., college of medicine), are welcome but should be viewed as only supplemental documentation.
- c. Outside evaluators should not have a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate. Academic evaluators should hold positions at institutions with a similar mission as The Ohio State University, and should hold at least the same title for which the applicant is being considered.
- d. Outside evaluation from officials of professional organizations may provide documentation regarding the candidate's contribution to professional and public service.
- e. Documentation from the units where a candidate holds a joint appointment is required.

Pre-Screening and Supportive Documentation.

1. Early in August, the division chair will review the list of names of outside evaluators supplied by the candidate in consultation with the eligible regular faculty of the division (those who are already at or above the rank for which the applicant is being considered). The names of outside evaluators supplied by the candidate that are deemed unacceptable to the division faculty will be replaced by the candidate. With the approval of the majority of appropriate division faculty, the chair will add the names of six outside evaluators to the list. The chair should review the roster of outside evaluators with the dean. Each evaluator will be asked by the division chair, using the form letter in the Appendix, to provide a letter that evaluates the research and other scholarly work of the candidate. Before sending the letter and evaluation materials, evaluators should be contacted informally by the division chair to determine whether they will serve. At least one or more of the evaluator letters should come from the candidate's list, and no more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate. At least six outside letters of evaluation should be obtained by September 15. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the division chair may not be included in the dossier.
2. With each candidate's application, the division chair must include a letter that evaluates the quality of academic performance and effectiveness of the candidate for the fourth-year review, and for tenure and/or promotion in the defined area of faculty responsibilities; i.e., teaching, research, professional competence, and service. To assist the writing of the evaluation letter, the chair shall obtain input from all eligible regular division faculty members (including regular clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate in the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Administration when regular clinical faculty are considered for promotion) at a group meeting specifically held for this purpose. Since each participant can have only one vote in this process, at the ballot meeting, no votes of the faculty are to be conducted at the division level. Evaluation at the division level should be completed and the application should be forwarded to the promotion and tenure committee by October 10.
3. When a faculty member holding a joint appointment is nominated, the collaborating unit should indicate in writing whether it will also recommend promotion and/or tenure or approval of the fourth-year review, if promotion/tenure/fourth-year review is approved in the college of pharmacy.
4. The application will be screened by the promotion and tenure committee to assure that it meets with procedural requirements, and that publications and grants listed in the dossier have been verified. The committee will include a signed letter with the dossier to show that the screening process has been completed.

The committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The promotion and tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.
5. The candidate should address questions during and after the review process of his/her application to the dean.

Review by Eligible Faculty.

1. The dossier and supporting documentation will be made available by October 15 to all eligible faculty (tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate). The review of applications will be coordinated by the promotion and tenure committee with the support of the dean's office. The following guidelines will be followed:
 - a. All eligible faculty will evaluate the credentials of a candidate undergoing fourth-year review, or seeking promotion (and tenure) to the level of associate professor, including those involved at earlier stages of the review.
 - b. The eligible full professors of the faculty will evaluate the credentials of a candidate seeking promotion to the level of full professor.
 - c. Additional information from the candidate and from any appropriate faculty member (i.e., any regular, regular clinical, or auxiliary faculty member at or above the rank sought by the candidate) may be sought via the promotion and tenure committee.
2. A "ballot meeting" of eligible faculty shall be convened by the promotion and tenure committee around November 1 to discuss each candidate and to vote to either approve or disapprove promotion and/or tenure. When regular clinical faculty are being considered for promotion, eligible regular clinical track faculty shall attend and participate. Eligible faculty approval of an application will require a two-thirds majority approval by those voting (abstentions not counted as voting). The meeting will be chaired by the chair of the promotion and tenure committee. The dossier of each candidate will be presented to the faculty by the committee. After discussion the vote shall be by secret ballot (Appendix). The final tally for each candidate will be determined by the promotion and tenure committee and reported to the dean of the college of pharmacy in a letter from the committee. The committee's letter should also summarize the sense of the faculty and the rationale for the outcome of the vote. The letter should provide the eligible faculty's assessment of quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service. The dean may attend the ballot meeting to hear the discussion but he or she is not eligible to vote. Assistant and associate deans may not attend the ballot meeting and may not vote; they may participate in the dean's evaluation of the candidate.

The quorum for the ballot meeting is 75% of the eligible faculty. No absentee ballots will be allowed. The time of the ballot meeting will be advertised at least three months in advance and every effort should be made to avoid major meetings that various groups of faculty will be attending.

2.2. Specific Guidelines**Fourth Year Review**

1. All initial appointments as an instructor or an assistant professor are probationary. The division chair in consultation with eligible division faculty members and the dean should evaluate the performance of each probationary faculty member annually using the FACULTY REVIEW Form (Appendix and Section IV).
2. The purpose of the annual review during the probationary period is:

- a. To document the evaluation of the candidate's performance on the criteria: teaching, research, professional competence, and service, as compared with the position expectations.
 - b. To assist the eligible faculty in their evaluation of the candidate's fourth-year review.
 - c. To provide input to the dean and the university for determination of whether the appointment will be renewed, subject to the standards of notice set forth in the Faculty Rules.
3. For the fourth-year review, copies of all annual reviews must be submitted by the division chair with the dossier to the eligible division faculty.
 4. Ordinarily, letters from outside evaluators are not sought during the fourth-year review, but such letters may be sought if they are judged appropriate.
 5. The fourth-year review will be conducted at the division level by the division chair, after consultation with the eligible division faculty. The dossier will be prepared and the college-level review will be carried out as described in Section VI.C.2.1. The promotion and tenure committee should attach a letter summarizing the results of the fourth-year review based on the dossier and the discussion and vote at the ballot meeting. The letter should assess the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance, recommendations for improvement, and should identify special concerns or conditions resulting from the fourth year review. The dean shall prepare a separate written assessment of the candidate and a recommendation, and forward the dossier to the provost who shall make the final decision.
 6. If the fourth year review is unsatisfactory, the candidate will be informed by the university that the appointment will not be renewed after the end of the fifth year.

Review at Assistant Professor Level for Promotion and Tenure.

1. The candidate will be reviewed according to the procedure outlined in Section VI.C.2.1. The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that:
 - a. the candidate has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service.
 - b. the candidate can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the college of pharmacy.
2. The candidate will be informed by the university, after normal review procedures during the sixth year of service, whether tenure will be granted beginning with the seventh year of service. If tenure is not granted, a one-year terminal appointment as assistant professor will be offered.

Review for Tenure at Professor or Associate Professor Level.

1. An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the office of academic affairs upon petition of the college. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of professor or associate professor require prior approval of the provost.

2. During the final probationary year, following normal review procedures, the candidate will be reviewed according to the procedure outlined in Section VI.C.2.1.
3. The candidate will be informed by the university if tenure is to be granted beginning with the next year of service. If tenure is not granted, a one-year terminal appointment as professor or associate professor will be offered.

Review for Promotion to Professor.

1. There is no time limit as to when an associate professor can be nominated for promotion to the rank of professor.
2. Each candidate being considered for promotion to professor must submit all the appropriate documents. As part of the dossier, the division chair shall provide copies of all annual evaluations since the effective date of appointment of the candidate at the associate professor level.
3. The candidate will be reviewed according to the procedure outlined in Section VI.C.2.1. The awarding of promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the candidate has:
 - a. a sustained record of excellence in teaching.
 - b. produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally.
 - c. demonstrated leadership in service.
4. After review of the candidate's dossier, all eligible full professors will discuss the case and vote at a ballot meeting. In a letter to the dean the promotion and tenure committee will summarize the recommendation of the faculty and present the rationale for the recommendation.

3.0. Review Procedure for Reappointment and/or Promotion of Regular Clinical Faculty

3.1. Summary of Procedures.

The procedures described below apply to regular clinical faculty with the ranks of Instructor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration, Assistant Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration, Associate Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration, and Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration. The procedures as specified below, cover annual review and fourth year review for first term appointments, fourth year review for subsequent terms, and promotion reviews. Recommendations are made to the dean of the College of Pharmacy. The results of promotion reviews are submitted to the provost.

3.2. Annual Activity Report.

Each member of the regular clinical faculty is expected to prepare an Annual Activity report of his/her professional activity. The report is to contain information on teaching, provision of pharmaceutical care, scholarship, and service. The standard format for the Annual Activity Report for The College of Pharmacy will be used. Information from this report is used in performing annual evaluations as noted subsequently.

3.3. Annual Reviews in the First Term of Appointment.

Each regular clinical faculty member will receive an annual review during the first five-year term of appointment. Annual reviews will be performed by the division chairperson after consultation with the divisional faculty above the rank of the individual being evaluated, and by the dean of the college. The Annual Report will be included in that faculty member's personnel file.

3.4. Fourth Year Reviews in First or Subsequent Terms of Appointment.

1. By June 30, the chair of the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Administration shall remind regular clinical faculty of the need to complete documentation in support of any candidate's reappointment or promotion review. By August 1, the candidate prepares the dossier according to guidelines provided by the office of academic affairs, a curriculum vitae, and copies of cover pages of all publications and grant award notices. Each application will be processed through all the procedural steps mandated by university policy. A written evaluation letter will be prepared by the chair by October 10. In the case of reappointment with no change in rank the chair's evaluation letter, including a recommendation of approval or disapproval that is supported by a vote of eligible division faculty, will be forwarded to the dean. When the faculty member is a candidate for promotion, the chair's evaluation letter will be prepared after consultation with the eligible division faculty and forwarded to the promotion and tenure committee.
2. The regular clinical candidate will be reviewed at the division level by the eligible division faculty (regular faculty and regular clinical faculty above current rank of the candidate, except for professor level where faculty can be at the same rank) and the division chair. The chair will prepare a letter, approved by a majority of eligible division faculty, to the dean summarizing the deliberations of the division and vote by eligible division members whether or not the regular clinical candidate's appointment is to be renewed. The recommendation during the fourth year of service will be one of the following: (1) re-appointment for a further period of five years, or (2) non-reappointment after the fifth year of service of the current term of appointment. This recommendation is subject to approval by the dean. Subsequently, the dean will submit a recommendation to the provost summarizing the results of the review by the division, (college in promotion cases), and the dean. However, if the recommendation is negative, the dean's decision on the case is final. The recommendation will be communicated in writing to the candidate by the dean as soon as possible.
3. In the event of a recommendation for non-reappointment, the notification letter must include the date when the regular clinical candidate's appointment will be terminated. The date will be based on the appropriate standard of notice. Upon written request by the candidate, reasons for the non-renewal shall be supplied in writing.

In the event of a positive recommendation, a copy of the statement summarizing the results of the review will be furnished to the candidate, who may, if desired, submit a response to the statement. A copy of the statement and response, if any, will be included in the candidate's personnel file.

3.5. Reviews of Regular Clinical Faculty for Promotion.

1. Promotion from Instructor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration to Assistant Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration, or from Assistant Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration to Associate Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration can be recommended at any time.
2. The review procedure is as outlined in section VI.C.2.1. "Eligible" division faculty are defined as regular faculty and regular clinical faculty at or above the rank sought. If review for promotion has not yet occurred prior to the fourth year review in the second term of appointment, such a review will be carried out by eligible division faculty as an integral part of that fourth-year review.

The recommendation of the eligible faculty will be one of the following: (1) Reappointment for a period of five years, with promotion to Assistant Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration or Associate Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration, as appropriate; (2) reappointment for a period of five years at the existing rank; (3) non-reappointment after the fifth year of service of the current term of appointment. In the event of a negative decision on reappointment or promotion, the dean's decision is final.

3. Promotion from Associate Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration to Professor of Clinical Pharmacy Practice and Administration can be recommended no earlier than the third year of service as an Associate Professor.

4.0. Review Procedure for Reappointment and/or Promotion of Regular Research Track Faculty

The general and specific guidelines are the same as for regular tenure-track faculty, as indicated in section IV.D.2.0 above.

5.0. Review Procedure for Appointment and Promotion of Auxiliary Faculty

5.1. General Comments

The review procedure for auxiliary faculty should be thorough, but generally less intensive than the procedures used for regular faculty and regular clinical faculty. The evaluation of professional competence of the auxiliary faculty member requires broader interpretation of "research and creative work" than that used in the traditional sense in the evaluation of regular and regular clinical faculty members. While some auxiliary faculty members are involved in research that results in refereed publications, auxiliary faculty members are generally not required to do so. Other avenues for publication include educational and professional journals for communication of original techniques, experiences, approaches and solutions to problems encountered in practice.

For auxiliary clinical faculty, examples of productivity include the size and growth rate of the practice, any innovative teaching techniques implemented, the number and type of innovative programs developed and implemented in practice, and the numbers of publications and professional presentations. Indicators of quality include frequency and type of consultation sought by physicians and other health care practitioners,

invited presentations at professional meetings, supportive evaluation letters from highly regarded practitioners and professional association leaders, and evidence of ability and success in making an impact on pharmacy practice. Outside evaluators for auxiliary clinical promotions may be sought from peers involved in provision of patient care who may not hold academic titles.

5.2. Dossier

The candidate, in consultation with the division chair, should prepare a dossier, according to the guidelines provided by the office of academic affairs, that captures the teaching, pharmaceutical practice, scholarly activity and service activities of the candidate. Key elements of the dossier that are required for regular and regular clinical faculty should be included, as appropriate. A curriculum vitae, along with the following supplemental information [Do not repeat this information if contained in the CV], is suggested to be submitted to the chair: [1] a description of the practice site and practice site development associated with the candidate (not required for non-clinical faculty), [2] courses taught, including development of new courses, and the role of the candidate in these courses, [3] the number of students precepted (since the last promotion), [4] continuing education courses taught (since last promotion), [5] any teaching honors received, [6] student evaluations of the candidate's teaching and precepting (since the last promotion), [7] demonstrated quality and high standards of practice at the practice site, as indicated by any honors, awards or recognition by professional societies, [8] documented scholarly activity, including any publications or professional presentations, [9] service to the college, university, profession and community should be documented and explained, including alumni activities, such as serving on the Alumni Governing Board, committee work, community service related to health care, and any professional service provided to health-related organizations.

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

5.3. Review

The eligible division faculty, at or above the rank being applied for, will review the dossier and, at a meeting called by the division chair specifically for this purpose, the application will be discussed by eligible faculty. The division chair shall write a letter of evaluation of the candidate that recommends approval or disapproval of the application. If the recommendation is to approve the application, the letter and supporting documents will be submitted to the promotion and tenure committee for presentation at

a ballot meeting of the eligible faculty of the college. The application will subsequently be handled, as described, for regular and regular clinical faculty.

D. Documentation

1.0. Documentation for Tenure and Promotion Review of Regular Faculty

1.1. Documentation Relative to Teaching.

Evaluation of teaching should be carried out by peer faculty and by students enrolled in courses taught by the faculty member. Peer evaluation of teaching is necessary to achieve a reliable, valid, and integrated understanding of the faculty member's overall performance. Information from students may be useful in judging the coherence and clarity of presentations, acquisition of knowledge and skills, and stimulation of interest. The method of evaluation of teaching may vary according to the type of instructional setting: (a) classroom teaching in degree programs, (b) one-on-one teaching, including mentoring of graduate students and undergraduate students in research, (c) small-group teaching, (d) teaching in continuing education programs and nontraditional programs, and (e) teaching at the practice site.

Peer evaluation. Peer evaluation should be comprehensive and should include those aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate. The frequency of peer review may vary according to rank and the evidence of need. Probationary faculty should be reviewed annually. Tenured faculty who aspire to promotion should be reviewed regularly, at least every three years, to provide a meaningful body of evidence. Senior faculty should be reviewed at least every five years, and more often if the previous review recommended that significant improvements were warranted.

Peer review will be carried out within each division by a three-member committee (Peer Review Committee) of the division faculty. The committee will be full professors appointed by the division chair to staggered three-year terms. The committee will meet at the beginning of each academic-year to identify the division faculty to be reviewed. Each faculty member to be reviewed will undergo primary review by one member of the committee, or a designee of the committee. The primary reviewer will assemble the salient data and information to be considered. The committee will meet as necessary, and will prepare a written report that evaluates the teaching of each faculty member who was reviewed. The report should be informed by student evaluation of the faculty member's teaching. The report should be submitted to the division chair and to the faculty member.

Student evaluation. Students should be given the opportunity to evaluate every course every time that it is taught (Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, Section IV (A)). The university Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument must be used for evaluation of all courses excepting seminar, independent studies, and professional experience program rotations (Pharmacy 493, 664, 693, 784, 799, 850, 993 and 999). Faculty may supplement this information using additional evaluation instruments or methods of their choice. The division chair should supervise the distribution of the evaluation instrument to students and its collection and analysis. A separate instrument should be used for each faculty member who participates significantly in the course. Efforts should be made to maximize the number of students who participate in the evaluation.

When there is a large discrepancy between the number of students enrolled and the number who participate in the evaluation, the evaluation cannot be assumed to accurately represent student opinion. When written comments are available, the Peer Review Committee should summarize the comments. The committee may wish to solicit letters supporting the faculty member's teaching effectiveness from former students and alumni suggested by the faculty member.

1. Classroom Teaching in Degree Programs:

Classroom teaching should be evaluated by students and by the Peer Review Committee. Section VI.A.1 enumerates teaching criteria that should be evaluated. The evaluation should include classroom visits or analysis of videotapes of the faculty member teaching, and critiques of course materials, reading assignments, and examinations. In-class observations should be documented by a written statement that evaluates the overall quality of teaching and the basis for that evaluation. The statement should indicate which course(s) were observed, how many classes were observed, and at what point in the quarter the observation(s) took place. The statement should be included as a part of the written report. Evaluators should have adequate knowledge of the content area. Extramural evaluation should be considered when there is an insufficient number of peers with the credentials or specific knowledge necessary for proper evaluation of the faculty member's teaching.

2. Other Teaching:

- a. One-on-one and Small-Group Teaching: The college recognizes that the mentoring of graduate students is an important teaching activity. The faculty member should prepare a statement of his or her mentoring activities. Other evidence of one-on-one and small-group teaching may include: results of externship and clerkship evaluation forms (required for participating clinical faculty); student evaluation of instruction (required except when the number of students is too small); letters from students and alumni; letters from peers (e.g., letters from auxiliary or regular faculty of equal or higher rank, physicians, or other co-workers); evidence of student interest in working with the faculty member on special projects, examinations, theses, and dissertations; and other indications of quality of projects supervised, such as publications in peer-reviewed journals. The Peer Review Committee should include an evaluation of these materials in its written report.
- b. Development of Courses, Curricula, Evaluation Instruments, and Innovative Teaching Materials: New course proposals and syllabi; evidence of effectiveness including enrollment information and acceptance of the course curriculum by other academic units within and outside the university; examples of innovative teaching materials; evidence of acceptance of materials beyond own classes (e.g., inclusion of materials in books, request for use by other faculty members, requests for material by practitioners and professional associations); and letters from students and alumni.
- c. Presentations Related to Teaching: The following activities should be documented by the faculty member and the Peer Review Committee should include an evaluation of them in its written report. Participation as a speaker or a panelist at state and national educational conferences; participation in workshops, seminars, and conferences intended to improve teaching skills; leadership or active committee

- service in educational associations; distribution of novel teaching and evaluation procedures, teaching materials, and other innovations to colleagues.
- d. Continuing Education: The following activities should be documented by the faculty member and the Peer Review Committee should include an evaluation of them in its written report. Program evaluation by participants; letters from coordinators; letters of evaluation from participants; and evidence that continuing education program material is used by participants in their own practice sites.
 - e. Distance Learning: In its report the Peer Review Committee should evaluate instructional materials developed for distance learning presentation. In addition to evaluation of course content and organization, and instrument(s) for evaluation of student learning, the effectiveness of the distance learning materials to convey the course content should be evaluated. Formal course evaluations by participants should be included.
 - f. Practice Site: The college recognizes that teaching at a practice site may represent a substantial component for some regular faculty. The Peer Review Committee should gather and evaluate evidence related to the practice-based teaching site. The faculty member should prepare a complete written description of his or her provision of pharmaceutical care and that of the student(s), residents, or fellows under the direct supervision of the faculty member. Documentation of teaching effectiveness must include results of formal student evaluations of teaching. Additional evidence may include letters of critical evaluation from peers (including physicians) based on direct observation of the faculty member at the practice site. Letters should evaluate appropriateness of teaching style, quality and clarity of written materials, and knowledge of the material.

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

1.2. Research and Other Scholarship

Although quantity is easier to measure than quality, evaluators must exercise extreme care in evaluating co-authored research. To facilitate the evaluation process, the candidate is expected to indicate the nature of contributions made to co-authored

research, and to separate refereed publications from other publications. Additionally, when a candidate has been involved in dissemination of essentially the same information several times (e.g., as a proceedings piece, an abstract, a journal article, and a book chapter), the candidate is expected to indicate clearly the relationships among various writings to aid in the evaluation.

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

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

1.3. Service and Professional Practice

There are many types of service contributions. University service by members of the faculty include, but are not limited to, the following activities: (a) serving as the division chair or in any other administrative capacity at the division, college, or university levels, (b) serving as a leader or member of task forces or committees providing service to the division, the college or the university, (c) contributing to student welfare as an advisor to student organizations and to students. Service outside the university can include: (a) serving as an appointed or elected officer of an academic or professional association, (b) serving as an organizer of workshops, panels, or meetings in areas of professional competence, (c) refereeing manuscripts submitted to journals, professional meeting program committees, membership on the editorial board of a journal, (d) serving as a speaker or presenter at non-academic meetings in areas of professional competence, (e) serving as a leader or member of a task force or committee providing service to local, state, regional, national, or international organizations, (f) serving as an unpaid and/or paid professional consultant to public or private organizations, (g) delivering pharmaceutical care.

1.4. Pharmaceutical Care (if applicable)

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

2.0. Documentation for Reappointment and/or Promotion Review of Regular Clinical Faculty

2.1. Teaching

Evaluation of teaching should be carried out by peer faculty and by students enrolled in courses taught by the faculty member. Peer evaluation of teaching is necessary to achieve a reliable, valid, and integrated understanding of the faculty member's overall performance. Information from students may be useful in judging the coherence and clarity of presentations, acquisition of knowledge and skills, and stimulation of interest. The method of evaluation of teaching may vary according to the type of instructional setting: (a) classroom teaching in degree programs, (b) one-on-one teaching, including mentoring of postdoctoral fellows and professional students, (c) small-group teaching, (d) teaching in continuing education programs and nontraditional or distance learning programs, and (e) teaching at the practice site.

Peer evaluation. Peer evaluation should be comprehensive and should include those aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate. The frequency of peer review may vary according to rank and the evidence of need. Faculty in their initial five-year term should be reviewed annually. Faculty who aspire to promotion should be reviewed regularly, at least every three years, to provide a meaningful body of evidence. Senior faculty should be reviewed at least every five years, and more often if the previous review recommended that significant improvements were warranted.

Peer review will be carried out by a three-member committee (Peer Review Committee) of the PPAD division faculty. The committee will be full professors appointed by the division chair to staggered three-year terms. The committee will meet at the beginning of each academic-year to identify the regular clinical faculty to be reviewed. Each faculty member to be reviewed will undergo primary review by one member of the committee, or a designee of the committee. The primary reviewer will assemble the salient data and information to be considered. The committee will meet as necessary, and will prepare a written report that evaluates the teaching of each faculty member who was reviewed. The report should be informed by student evaluation of the faculty member's teaching. The report should be submitted to the division chair and to the faculty member.

The candidate should provide the Peer Review Committee a written description of his/her philosophy of teaching. Regular clinical faculty may be involved in instruction in practice/clerkship format, lecture format, small group discussion/workshop format, laboratory format, or formats using distance learning techniques. Teaching and learning activities may include developing, conducting, and evaluating: (1) significant experiential educational courses, such as externship or clerkship experiences, (2) lectures, workshops, or a course, (3) self-study materials, including computer-based instruction materials, and special projects that enhance student learning and professional growth, (4) materials or ideas obtained from attending education-oriented meetings or membership in associations that have resulted in new teaching approaches.

Student evaluation. Students should be given the opportunity to evaluate every course every time that it is taught (Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, Section IV [A]). The university Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument must be used for evaluation of all courses excepting seminar, independent studies, and professional experience program rotations (Pharm. 493, 664, 693, 784, 799, 850, 993 and 999). Faculty may supplement this information using additional evaluation instruments or methods of their choice. The division chair should supervise the distribution of the evaluation instrument to students and its collection and analysis. A separate instrument should be used for each faculty member who participates significantly in the course. Efforts should be made to maximize the number of students who participate in the evaluation. When there is a large discrepancy between the number of students enrolled and the number who participate in the evaluation, the evaluation cannot be assumed to accurately represent student opinion. When written comments are available, the Peer Review Committee should summarize the comments.

Peer reviewers may wish to solicit letters supporting the faculty member's teaching effectiveness from former students and alumni suggested by the faculty member. Other documentation may include unsolicited letters from students and others who have observed the candidate's teaching, peers participating in team teaching with the candidate (including physician colleagues), or comments from experts in teaching techniques like individuals from Faculty and TA Development. Solicited letters should evaluate teaching style, quality and clarity of written materials used in teaching, depth, currency, and knowledge of subjects taught. Documentation in continuing education instruction may include indications of usage of continuing education program material by participants in their own practice sites. Evidence that course work or site development contributed to prior learning credits being awarded to practitioners (in applying to a non-traditional Pharm.D. program, for example) should also be considered as documentation of teaching effectiveness. Additional documentation includes nomination for and/or receipt of teaching awards, presentation of teaching methods at national meetings, materials related to development of courses, lectures, workshops or clerkships, and evidence of acceptance of materials beyond the candidate's own teaching activities (e.g., inclusion of materials in books, request for use by other faculty members, requests for material by practitioners and professional associations). Provision is encouraged of documentation that suggests effective or enhanced student learning, or impact on life-long learning and that relates to teaching practices. Specific measures taken to improve teaching should also be documented and appropriately evaluated.

2.2. Delivery of Pharmaceutical Care

Various approaches for documentation of the impact made by the candidate on patient care can be used. The documentation should include a clear description of the pharmacy practice offered. Structure, process, and scope of the practice and the specific role of the candidate should be discussed. If a fellow or resident is associated with the candidate, both the direct and indirect role of the candidate to patient care should be separately described. Emphasis will be given to documented positive outcomes; e.g., increased efficacy or safety, decreased cost of care, improved patient compliance with medication regimens, and improved quality of life. Observations and evaluation of patient-care activities should be carried out by peers and students. The candidate should keep a summary of major contributions made to patient care. Patient care activities should be documented, and the major focus should be to clearly demonstrate the candidate's impact on improvement of patient care. For reappointment and promotion review, the division chair should arrange peer evaluation of the candidate's documented patient care activities. Excellence in an area of practice may be documented by the development of guidelines, policies, and implementation of unique and innovative patient-care programs. Further documentation includes the achievement of accreditation of the faculty member's training program (i.e., residency).

The candidate should document whether elements of his/her program have been transferred to other clinical sites or institutions. Further indicators of success may include the impact on standards of practice, contributions to the body of knowledge in the candidate's area of practice, and honors, awards, or recognition's, by various professional societies at the local, state, national or international level. Additional documentation will include frequency and types of consultation sought; letters from physicians, administrators, other clinical practitioners, and co-workers; and honors and awards which reflect excellence in clinical practice.

2.3. Scholarly Activity and Other Creative Work

The impact of scholarly work on clinical practice and/or education will be evaluated by contributions to journals or other publications in which this work appears (peer-reviewed publications are preferred), and invited or peer-reviewed presentations of the scholarly activity at local, state, or national professional organizations. Publications can be in the form of original research papers, critical reviews of the literature, case reports, invited commentaries, book chapters/monographs, letters to the editor, and book reviews. Candidates, for example, may determine the frequency of an adverse effect associated with the routine use of a drug; evaluate comparative clinical or economic efficacy of various types of treatments; assess the pattern of drug use in patients with a specific disease; identify an unusual or unique clinical experience with a drug; assess impact of practice management innovations; describe improved ways of monitoring pharmacotherapy; or assess the effectiveness of various teaching methods.

2.4. Service

Service to the university may be documented by contributions to committees at the division, college, practice site, and/or university levels, leadership in chairing committees or accomplishing other administrative work at any of these levels, activity and effectiveness as an advisor to students or student organizations, and teaching non-

OSU pharmacy students (medical students, interns, high-school students). Service to professional societies may include such indicators of quality as contributions as a committee member or chair, serving as an elected or an appointed officer, and serving as an organizer of, or participant in, programs of a professional society, and continuing education presentations. Requests to referee manuscripts, serve as a speaker at non-academic meetings, edit journals, or serve as a consultant are other indicators of quality of service.

E. Procedures: Regular Research Track Faculty

3.0. Documentation for Reappointment and/or Promotion Review of Regular Research Track Faculty

The general and specific guidelines are the same as for regular tenure-track faculty, as indicated in section E.1.2 (Research and Other Scholarship) above.

F. Post Review Procedures

1. The promotion and tenure committee's letter will ordinarily be submitted to the dean within two weeks of the ballot meeting.
2. After receiving the letter, the dean may meet with the committee to clarify the content of the letter. The committee may revise its letter after meeting with the dean, to remove ambiguities or to clarify the content of the letter. The dean may, after meeting with the committee, solicit additional information regarding the candidate. If substantive new information is obtained, the promotion and tenure committee should be consulted to consider whether the case should be reconsidered by the faculty.
3. The dean shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and a recommendation for inclusion in the dossier. If the dean disagrees with the faculty's recommendation, he/she will inform the eligible faculty in writing the reason(s) for rejecting the recommendation of the faculty.
4. The dean should notify the candidate in writing of the completion of the tenure initiating unit review and of the availability of the reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the dean with written comments on the review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of completion of the review. The promotion and tenure committee and/or the dean may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the review is permitted.
5. The dean shall forward to the provost his or her recommendation along with the faculty's recommendation and the supporting documents.
6. The dean will inform the candidate and the chair of the promotion and tenure committee in writing of the actions of the university administration on the recommendations at appropriate times (within ten working days of receiving notice).
7. If a positive recommendation to promote and tenure an assistant professor is rejected at the university level, the dean will meet with the promotion and tenure

committee to determine whether to petition the provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review (Faculty Rule 3335-6-05). This would not be done until the summer preceding the seventh year because additions to the record that justified the petition would need to be noted.

G. Appeals

It is the policy of The Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in the faculty rules and as supplemented by the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in this document. If a candidate believes that a nonrenewal decision or negative promotion or promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in rule 3335-5-05.

H. Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) 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 review. The text of the rule follows.

3335-6-05 *Criteria and procedures for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions and appointment nonrenewals and for seventh year reviews.*

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

If the dean concurs with the tenure initiation unit's petition, the dean shall in turn petition the provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the nonrenewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

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

I. Revision

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

APPENDIX

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

Dear _____:

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

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

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

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

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

The university requires documentation of your credentials as a reviewer. It would therefore be helpful if you supplied us with a short biographical sketch; e.g., the NIH Grant Application Biosketch or similar 1-2 page biographical sketch, that we could forward along with your critical assessment. We would appreciate receiving your report by _____, at the latest.

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

Sincerely,

Professor and Chair

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

Dear _____:

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

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

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

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

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

The university requires documentation of your credentials as a reviewer. It would therefore be helpful if you supplied us with a short biographical sketch; e.g., the NIH Grant Application Biosketch or similar 1-2 page biographical sketch, that we could forward along with your critical assessment. We would appreciate receiving your report by _____, at the latest.

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

Sincerely,

Professor and Chair

BALLOT

CANDIDATE: _____

Vote to approve or disapprove the candidate's application for (circle one):
fourth-year review promotion promotion and tenure

_____ APPROVE

_____ DISAPPROVE

_____ ABSTAIN

FACULTY REVIEW
The OSU College of Pharmacy
(Year ____)

CANDIDATE:

DATE:

Outstanding
Excellent
Good

OPTIONAL EVALUATION SCALE:

Satisfactory
Needs Improvement and/or More Effort
Unsatisfactory

EVALUATION:

TEACHING

RESEARCH

SERVICE

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

SIGNATURES:

Faculty

Date

Chair

Date

Dean

Date

FACULTY COMMENTS:

(Attach additional pages if necessary)

I. TEACHING

EVALUATION:

II. RESEARCH

EVALUATION:

III. SERVICE

EVALUATION: