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OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
II. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 47 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure), procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews specified by the OSU Office of Academic Affairs, and any additional policies established by the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) or the University. Details on faculty rules can be found on-line at the Board of Trustees web site (http://www.osu.edu/offices/trustees/Chaplndex/index.html) and OAA policies at the web-based Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/tc.html). It is governed by the Criteria and Procedures for Appointments, Promotion and Tenure established by the CFAES and by the CFAES Faculty Reward System Guidelines for Annual Performance Review, Promotion, and Tenure adopted February 8, 2000. Should any of those rules and policies change, the Department 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 Department Chairperson (herein refered to as the Chairperson).

This document requires approval of the Dean of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (herin refered to as the Dean of the college) and the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University before it can be implemented. It sets forth the mission of the Department of Plant Pathology and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the CFAES and the University, its criteria and procedures for: 1) faculty appointments, 2) faculty promotion and tenure, and 3) rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document the Dean of the college and the Executive Vice President and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in these various evaluations.

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.

III. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION

The mission of the Department of Plant Pathology (adopted by the faculty in 1995, amended 2000 and 2001) is the scientific investigation of environmental and biological causes of plant diseases and the nature of plant-microbe interactions. The knowledge obtained in pursuit of this mission provides the means to discover, develop, and apply innovative strategies for environmentally sound and economically viable management of plant disease. We educate students, professionals and other stakeholders in all aspects of plant disease and plant health management, and we communicate unbiased information to urban and rural citizens. We promote teamwork among ourselves and our partners to improve the quality of life in both urban and rural settings and to promote responsible management of natural and renewable resources.

Plant diseases represent a significant threat to the economic stability of agricultural industries and to quality of life issues for the citizens of Ohio and people worldwide. Plant pathogens seriously impact human and animal life by reducing crop productivity and poisoning the food supply. Plant diseases are a constant threat to the economic viability of farms and rural communities, and when epidemics occur they can cause malnutrition and famine among large populations in developing countries. For urban populations, the impact of plant diseases is to increase food prices, reduce food quality, and negatively impact the aesthetic and practical design of plants in the urban landscape. To deal with these realities, our vision is to be considered the most credible source of unbiased, science-based information in Ohio on plant
diseases and plant health management. We strive to be recognized as a leader, both nationally and internationally, for the highest quality research and educational programs on plant-microbe interactions and plant health management.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria for appointment

In light of the stated mission of The Ohio State University to attain "international distinction in education, scholarship, and public service", the Department of Plant Pathology commits itself to appointing to the faculty only those persons who will enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the Department and advance its mission as stated above in Section III. Criteria for appointment shall follow Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 Criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure.

1. Tenure Track faculty

A minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor is completion of an earned doctorate in plant pathology or a related field of study. In addition, the candidate must have a record of scholarly achievement that demonstrates, as judged by the faculty, a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. Criteria for appointment at higher ranks will be consistent with criteria for promotion to those ranks discussed herein in Section VII Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion.

Probationary periods of appointment of tenure track faculty will be in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 Probationary service, duration of appointments for regular faculty. An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior outside 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. 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 Department and the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, paragraph D (Exclusion of time from probationary periods) provides for time to be excluded from the probationary period for birth or adoption of a child, personal illness, care of sick or injured persons, or other factors beyond a faculty member’s control that significantly interfered with productivity. Although probationary faculty may apply for consideration of an exclusion at any time within the limits of the rule, individuals are not required to apply for excluded time under any circumstances.

2. Auxiliary faculty
Auxiliary faculty include compensated and no-salary faculty who serve the Department in some significant capacity but are not in tenure-track positions at the University. In the Department of Plant Pathology, compensated auxiliary faculty, who are hired to perform a specific service, may include visiting faculty on leave from other academic institutions or temporary faculty. No-salary auxiliary faculty may include visiting faculty on leave from other academic institutions and adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty include government scientists (primarily employees of the United States Department of Agriculture) who are housed within the Department and other allied professionals who contribute in a significant way to the academic work of the Department. All auxiliary appointments are made for only one year and require formal annual renewal if they are to be continued. Appointments of visiting faculty may not exceed three continuous years.

Visiting faculty who hold academic titles at other academic institutions will be appointed at the same rank they hold at their own institution with the modified title of Visiting Associate Professor, etc. Adjunct faculty, whether or not they are housed within the Department of Plant Pathology, will be expected to have substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department, including such activities as participation or substantial collaboration in Departmental research programs, advising students, providing seminars or guest lectures in courses, serving on Department committees, and/or appropriate outreach activities. Criteria for appointment to and promotion in academic rank for adjunct faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty will hold modified titles of Adjunct Associate Professor, etc.

3. **Courtesy faculty**

Courtesy faculty have no-salary joint appointments to the Department of Plant Pathology. Appointees are regular Ohio State University faculty from other tenure initiating units. Courtesy appointments will be made only for faculty who are substantially involved in the academic work of the Department. This may include significant involvement or collaboration in departmental research programs, and/or participation in activities such as advising plant pathology students, team teaching in departmental or cross-listed courses, providing guest lectures, or participation in departmental extension programming. Courtesy appointments are made at the same rank held in their home Department. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal, but continuation will require ongoing contributions to departmental activities.

4. **Emeritus faculty**

Emeritus faculty have no-salary appointments in the Department of Plant Pathology. Appointments as emeritus faculty are made only for retired faculty of the University who had been regular faculty members in the Department prior to retirement, and who have made a request to the Department for emeritus status. Emeritus faculty do not require formal annual review.

Emeritus faculty may not vote in the governance of the Department or participate in promotion and tenure decisions. Office, laboratory, and other facilities may be provided to emeritus faculty members, depending on the available resources and the stated needs of the retired individual. The
Chairperson makes all decisions regarding use of facilities. Use of departmental resources will be evaluated yearly by the Chairperson.

B. Search and appointment procedures

1. Tenure track faculty

For each prospective tenure track faculty position, the Chairperson will appoint a search committee composed of four Department faculty. Faculty from both campuses will be included on all search committees, typically two from the Columbus campus and two from the Wooster campus. A fifth member from another academic unit with activities relevant to the position will usually be appointed as a member of each search committee. The Chairperson will appoint one of the members of the search committee to serve as committee Chairperson, usually one of the departmental faculty residing at the campus on which the new appointment is to be made. The Chairperson will also appoint one of the committee members (other than the Chairperson) as the ‘Procedures Oversight Designee’ (formerly known as the ‘Affirmative Action’ representative). The committee will develop a position description, which must be approved by the Chairperson and by a majority vote of the faculty. The Chairperson will then submit the position description and a justification statement to the administrative cabinet of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences to obtain permission to initiate a search.

All search procedures for tenure track faculty will be in accordance with University procedures as outlined in the bulletin *A Guide to Effective Searches* published by the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Academic Affairs, and with guidelines from the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. The position will be advertised in an appropriate manner to attract national and international attention to the opening. Vigorous efforts will be taken to attract a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. Complete records will be kept of the manner in which the search is conducted and of all contacts with prospective candidates. Application files will be kept in a secure location, but made accessible to all Department faculty for their review. Following the open application period, members of the search committee will carefully review the files of all applicants and seek relevant information from other sources as appropriate. The criteria used in evaluation of the candidates and all records of the search process will be documented. All Department faculty will be encouraged to review the files at this time and make their views known to members of the search committee. Based on their own views, and comments from the faculty and the Chairperson, the search committee will select the applicants for interview (usually 3 or 4 individuals). The committee chair will notify the Chairperson in writing of their choices, listing criteria for the selection of these candidates based solely on valid academic experience and achievement.

The Chairperson and search committee chair will together arrange for and conduct campus interviews of the final candidates. Interview procedures will include visits to both the Columbus and Wooster campuses, presentation of a formal seminar, visits with appropriate administrators of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, and the opportunity for each
member of the faculty to visit with each candidate either privately or in small groups of faculty. Following completion of the interviews, the Chairperson will call a meeting of the entire faculty to discuss the candidates. After full discussion of all candidates, a vote of the entire faculty will be taken. If a candidate receives a positive vote from % of the faculty who participated in the interview process (including the Chairperson), the voting process will be considered complete and the Chairperson will forward a recommendation to the Dean of the college to extend an offer to this candidate. If no candidate receives support from at least % of the faculty in the initial vote, discussion will then be re-opened. Following discussion, the faculty will vote again to see if any of the interviewed candidates is found acceptable to at least % of the faculty. If, after discussion and several ballots, no candidate ultimately receives support from % of the faculty, further candidates will be interviewed until a candidate can be found who engenders such support. All offers at the rank of associate professor or professor, with or without tenure, and all offers involving the acceptance of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Education.

Faculty members may be selected through the actions of an Interdisciplinary Program of the University, using procedures approved for the specific Interdisciplinary Program. A candidate can request academic appointment (i.e., ‘tenure-initiating-unit’ appointment) in the Department of Plant Pathology after the person has been selected by the members of the Interdisciplinary Program. Such a request must include a copy of the curriculum vitae of the candidate, and a letter outlining the reasons for desiring the appointment in the Department. The Chairperson will call a meeting of the faculty to discuss the candidate, and then a vote will be taken of the full faculty (including the Chairperson). A candidate must receive a % positive vote for appointment. The Chairperson informs the Dean of the college and the administrative leader of the Interdisciplinary Program in writing of the outcome of the vote.

2. Auxiliary faculty

Visiting faculty usually come to the Department as a result of an association with an individual member of the faculty and plan to work in their laboratory for a defined period of time while they are on leave from their own institution. Appointments of visiting faculty are made by approval of the Chairperson following the development and approval of specific plans for scholarly activities to be undertaken during the time the visiting faculty member will be in residence in the Department. Appointment for more than one year requires a majority vote of the faculty. Scientists from outside the University may work in faculty laboratories without appointment for up to three months with permission of the Chairperson.

Adjunct faculty usually come to the Department as a result of: 1) their employment as a scientist within a unit of a governmental research organization (usually the United States Department of Agriculture) located on the Columbus or Wooster campus, 2) their interest in direct participation or collaboration in the academic programs of the Department, and 3) the Department’s willingness to provide them with office and/or laboratory space. Request for an adjunct appointment in the Department for a government scientist will usually follow appointment of the person to a scientific
position by the governmental agency and may be initiated by the scientist or by faculty members of the Department. In some cases, requests for adjunct status may come from allied professionals not in residence within the Department (i.e., using office and/or laboratory facilities under Departmental control) who wish to participate in the academic programs of the Department. In all cases of requests for adjunct status, a complete, updated curriculum vitae of the candidate will be submitted to the Chairperson who will transmit copies to all Department faculty. At a faculty meeting, the candidate will appear before the faculty, indicate his/her interest in joining the Department with adjunct faculty status, and outline the role that he/she intends to take in the academic programs of the Department. Adjunct status will be granted upon a positive vote of the faculty present and approval of the Chairperson, the Dean of the college, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Adjunct faculty may participate in all Departmental activities but are not accorded voting rights. The activities of adjunct faculty resident within the Department will be reviewed annually by the same procedures used for regular faculty, discussed herein in Section V. Annual reviews. The activities of all other adjunct faculty will be reviewed annually by the Chairperson and brought to the attention of the faculty. If at any time the regular faculty of the Department judge that any adjunct member of the faculty has not maintained a substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department, renewal of adjunct status can be disapproved by majority vote of the regular faculty, effective at the end of any annual appointment period. If adjunct status is revoked, further use of departmental space and facilities will be reevaluated and may be denied by the Chairperson if no longer deemed appropriate.

3. Courtesy faculty

Request for a courtesy appointment in the Department for a faculty member from another tenure initiating unit within the University may be initiated by that person or by faculty members of the Department. A complete, updated curriculum vitae of the candidate will be submitted to the Chairperson who will transmit copies to all Department faculty. At a faculty meeting, the candidate will appear before the faculty, indicate his/her interest in joining the Department with courtesy faculty status, and outline the role that he/she intends to take in the academic programs of the Department. Courtesy faculty status, at the same rank as in the tenure initiating unit, will be granted upon a majority vote of the faculty and approval of the Chairperson. Courtesy faculty may participate in all Departmental activities but are not accorded voting rights. The activities of courtesy faculty will be reviewed annually by the Chairperson and brought to the attention of the faculty. If at any time the faculty of the Department judge that a courtesy member of the faculty has not maintained a substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department, courtesy faculty status can be disapproved by majority vote of the regular faculty, effective at the end of any academic year. If courtesy status is revoked, further use of Departmental space and facilities, if any, will be reevaluated and may be denied by the Chairperson if no longer deemed appropriate.

4. Emeritus faculty

Request for appointment as an emeritus faculty member must originate with the retired or retiring faculty member. Typically, the request is made in a letter to the Chairperson 3 months before or
after the retirement date. The Chairperson then conducts a vote of the full faculty (including the Chairperson) for appointment. A \% positive vote is necessary for appointment. The Chairperson notifies the retired faculty member and Dean of the college in writing of the outcome of the vote. No annual reappointment is necessary.

C. Nature of appointments for tenure-track faculty

Tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Plant Pathology have appointments in one or more areas from three separate funding sources: The Ohio State University general fund (OSU); Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC); and The Ohio State University Extension (OSUE). An OSU appointment is primarily for classroom teaching and student advising, but also includes broad scholarly activity. An appointment with OARDc is primarily for research directed towards the OARDC mission. An appointment with OSUE is for extension (outreach) teaching. All faculty appointments, regardless of funding source, carry responsibility for graduate student advising and for scholarly activity.

V. ANNUAL REVIEWS

The Department of Plant Pathology has a longstanding tradition of conducting two types of annual peer reviews of faculty performance, each with a unique and specific purpose. The ANNUAL PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW is held each June by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure (DPT) Committee. At this time, the DPT committee meets individually with each member of the Department faculty to obtain his/her views on the progress towards promotion and tenure of each promotion and tenure-eligible member of the Department faculty. Membership on the DPT committee, the role of the DPT committee in annual reviews for promotion and tenure, and the procedures used by this Department for evaluation of probationary and tenured faculty for promotion and tenure are discussed herein in Section VII, Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion. Further discussion of annual reviews in this section shall be limited to the second peer review procedure used by this Department, the ANNUAL FACULTY PROGRAM REVIEW.

A. Faculty program review committee

The program review of each faculty member in the Department is conducted annually, generally in January or February, by the Faculty Program Review (FPR) Committee. The FPR committee consists of six persons: the Chairperson and associate chair, the two professors who are elected by the faculty during the previous year to serve on the DPT committee the summer prior to the faculty program review, and two additional faculty members (any rank), preferably one each from the Columbus and Wooster campuses, who are elected by the faculty during the previous year to serve on this committee for a 1-year term. Election of these latter two members normally occurs in September prior to the review. If any of the four elected members of the FPR committee becomes unavailable and cannot serve on the review, then the Chairperson shall appoint a
replacement. The purpose of the Faculty Program Review is: 1) to evaluate the extent and quality of the teaching, extension, student advising, research, and service activities of each member of the Department faculty during the previous calendar year, 2) to engage each faculty member in a constructive, evaluative discussion of his/her performance, 3) to review with each faculty member their plans for the coming year as outlined in their Annual Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations and any associated changes in their Position Description, and 4) to make recommendations to the Chairperson regarding the content of the Chairperson’s annual performance review letter written to each faculty member.

B. Faculty program review document and review sessions

Each year in advance of the faculty program review, every faculty member prepares an annual program review document according to procedures specified by the Chairperson. This document, usually submitted to the Departmental office by a specified date in early January, includes: 1) all accomplishments by the faculty member in teaching, extension, student advising, scholarship, and service during the previous calendar year and any indicators of quality or impact of performance, either as an individual or member of a team; 2) an Annual Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations that outlines his/her plans for the coming year, and 3) a Position Description that briefly outlines the overall responsibilities of the position in the areas of teaching (classroom and extension), research and/or creative scholarly work, outreach, and service, and any requested changes in this description. Members of the FPR committee have access to the program review documents of all faculty and are requested to read them prior to the actual review. Copies of the previous three years’ annual performance review letters for all faculty are made available to the committee. Review sessions are conducted on both the Columbus and Wooster campuses. In each session, the FPR committee meets with each member of the faculty for up to one hour. During the meeting, the faculty member is given the opportunity to highlight to the committee his/her most significant accomplishments during the previous year. Members of the committee ask pertinent questions and provide constructive comments to the faculty member on his/her performance and plans for the coming year as outlined in the Annual Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations. Any proposed changes in the Position Description are discussed, but changes must be approved by the Chairperson in private dialogue with the faculty member. A make-up review session is held for faculty who are unable to schedule their review during the primary meetings of the FPR committee. Make-up reviews may be scheduled with one or more members of the committee linked up via telephone.

C. Performance letters

Following completion of all reviews, the FPR committee makes recommendations to the Chairperson regarding comments that should be included in the annual performance review letter written to each faculty member. The Chairperson, with the assistance of the associate chair, then prepares draft performance review letters for each member of the faculty. These letters include background information on their current appointment (including percent OSU/OSUE/OARDC, as described in Section IV.C [page 8], of this document) and years since appointment or last promotion (assistant and associate professors). Comments are then made on their performance
during the last calendar year in teaching and/or extension, scholarship, and service, as compared
with goals set at the last review in their Annual Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations and
their Position Description. Comments are made on their plans for the coming year and suggestions
are made for improvement as appropriate. Draft letters are given to all members of the FPR
committee for further comment. After receiving final comments from committee members, the
Chairperson, with the assistance of the associate chair, prepares the final letters, delivers them to
each faculty member, and places a copy in their personnel file. Copies of the final letters are
made available to members of the FPR committee for their review, but are not retained by them.
If a faculty member wishes to write a rebuttal to his/her performance review letter, he/she may
do so and a copy of the rebuttal will be attached to the copy of the performance review letter that
is retained in the faculty member's personnel file. Although individual meetings with the
Chairperson are not scheduled annually for each faculty member to discuss his/her performance
evaluation, such a meeting will be scheduled following delivery of the annual performance review
letter if requested by either the Chairperson or the faculty member.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. Criteria

Acceptable work is required of all faculty members -- exceptional work will be rewarded. All
faculty are expected to demonstrate continued intellectual engagement as members of this
Department. Annual salary increases will be given to faculty based solely on meritorious
performance, except in cases when a "cost of living" increase for all employees is mandated by
the University. In determining merit, consideration will be given to performance during the
previous year, to the record of performance during the past several years, and to the
appropriateness of the salary level with regard to the individual's overall record of
accomplishments. Consideration also will be given to the achievement of any specific written
goals as specified in the previous annual performance review letter to the individual from the
Chairperson.

Faculty performance will be evaluated in light of individual contributions made to advancement
of the Department's mission, as stated herein in Section III. The roles and responsibilities of
individual faculty with regard to components of the Departmental mission vary considerably and
are reflected by their appointment (see section IV.C, page 8). However, all faculty are expected
to advise graduate students and to engage in scholarly activity. Most faculty in the Department
of Plant Pathology have appointments that are split among two, or in some cases all three areas
of responsibility (OSU/OARDC/OSUE). In making judgments about faculty performance,
expectations for accomplishments will be related to the relative proportion of assigned
responsibilities in each area. Additional details of performance expectations in each of these areas
are specified herein in Section VII of this document.

The mission of the Department and the necessity for positive interactions and contributions within
the community of scholars cannot be achieved without the demonstration of faculty citizenship and
collegiality. All faculty members are expected to make positive contributions with respect to academic service, contribute to and participate in professional organizations and activities, and contribute to and participate in the academic functions of the Department. Areas of participation include: attendance and participation in seminars, invited speaker programs, faculty meetings, committee meetings, student activities where faculty participation is expected or invited, etc. Faculty members also are expected to demonstrate respect and responsible behavior towards peers, staff, students and customers. In this regard, a record of good citizenship within the Department will be an important consideration when evaluating faculty performance for the determination of salary increases, although this will be considered as a part of the evaluation of teaching performance, scholarship and quality of service provided. Special consideration will be given to faculty who provide extraordinary service, but this will not relieve them of demonstrating excellence in scholarly activities.

Faculty who are on professional leave, serving as visiting professors, or participating professionally in approved off-campus assignments, will not be penalized by loss of a salary increase while away from the Department. In these cases, the faculty member will provide to the Chairperson and associate chair a timely progress report of his/her activities containing sufficient information for their review.

B. Procedure for determining annual merit increases

Among the most important decisions made by the Chairperson and associate chair are those concerned with recommendations for annual salary increases. All available information will be carefully weighed in making salary decisions. The Chairperson and associate chair will stay abreast of activities of all faculty members by keeping thorough records, by frequent consultation with each faculty member, by holding meetings of the entire faculty, and by any other communication needed to stay in touch with faculty progress. In this regard, particular emphasis will be given to the ANNUAL FACULTY PROGRAM REVIEW and the ANNUAL PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW. Information obtained from both these review sessions and from written documents submitted by each faculty member prior to each review (updated P&T dossiers and Faculty Program Review reports) will be weighed carefully when evaluating faculty performance. No mathematical formula will be used for evaluation of faculty, but consideration will be given to accomplishments in all areas of faculty responsibility, that is, teaching, scholarship, and service.

Determining recommendations for annual salary increases is particularly difficult because each department is allocated a fixed amount of funds that can be distributed as merit increases. Thus, for any person to receive an above-average salary increase, someone else must receive less. Working together, the Chairperson and associate chair will determine for each tenure-track faculty member a recommended salary increase based on the total funds available and the performance criteria specified above. In making this determination, consideration will be given not only to the percentage increase in salary represented by the proposed raise, but to its actual dollar amount, and to the appropriateness of the individual’s salary level with regard to his/her overall record of accomplishments and the salaries of other departmental faculty. In particularly meritorious cases,
applications to the Dean of the college will be made for special excellence/equity raises, if supplementary funds for such are available in a given year. Faculty that are promoted will also receive a promotional raise in addition to their annual supplement. A decision to recommend no salary increase is an option that will be considered in cases that are particularly non-meritorious. All salary recommendations will be brought to members of the Dean’s cabinet at a meeting called each year to obtain their comments and approval. Results of salary decisions will be communicated to each faculty member in writing, usually in June, when final approvals have been received.

Faculty who have concerns about their salary or annual adjustments to their salary should schedule a meeting with the Chairperson to discuss their concerns and obtain explanations for decisions that have been made regarding their salary. If they are still not satisfied, they may appeal their case to the Faculty Salary Grievance Committee of the FAES Faculty Council. In order to be eligible to have their appeal considered, faculty must 1) be regular faculty members, 2) have not had a salary appeal decision rendered by this body in the last three academic years, and 3) demonstrate that their salary is at least 5% below the average salary of all other faculty in the department of the same rank. In this regard, the faculty of the Department of Plant Pathology voted on October 29, 1998, that “there are no apparent distinct salary markets among faculty in the Department of Plant Pathology” and thus all salary grievance comparisons will be made with the average salary of all faculty within a given rank, exclusive of the Chairperson. Appeals to the Faculty Salary Grievance Committee must be initiated no later than October 31 in order to facilitate completion of the review before salary recommendations are made for the next academic year.

C. Other rewards

Allocation of Departmental resources for use by individual faculty in the conduct of their specific research, teaching and/or extension programs will be based on their need for these resources, the availability of the resources within the Department, and the record of the faculty member in productive use of Departmental resources. Departmental resources include laboratory and office space, Departmental equipment, assigned laboratory technicians, and allocated Departmental operational funds. Decisions regarding allocation and reallocation of Departmental resources to individual faculty will be made by the Chairperson and associate chair on the basis of merit using the same criteria specified above for merit salary increases.

VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION

A. General considerations

Promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure, and promotion to full professor, are based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a scholar and teacher, and as one who provides effective service to the Department, College, University, and/or
profession. It should be emphasized that faculty members have appointments in one or more areas from three funding sources: OSU general funds, OARDC, and OSUE, as described in Section IV.C (page 8). Thus, faculty performance shall be evaluated in the context of their specific appointment, their position description, and their agreed-upon annual goals, with primary emphasis given to areas where the individual has more substantial commitments. In all instances, however, superior scholarship, in accordance with the criteria set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6, is an essential qualification for promotion. Teaching, research and/or creative work, outreach, and service are not considered to be acts of scholarship, in and of themselves. Excellent performance in these activities will be rewarded with salary increases. However, for tenure and promotion in rank, sufficient evidence of superior scholarship is required.

**Teaching** in the Department of Plant Pathology includes activities such as formal (credit-earning) classroom teaching, continuing education, advising undergraduates and graduate students, directing thesis research and independent study projects, and/or extension (outreach) education. Depending on his/her appointment, an individual may have responsibility for none to several formal OSU courses. For extension or outreach education, teaching is through workshops, ‘in-service’ training, short-courses, demonstrations in grower ‘field-days’, preparation of written and electronically-distributed educational materials, one-on-one instruction and diagnostic and clinical activities, and other non-degree educational programs. **Scholarship** in the Department occurs through individual or team-based accomplishments that lead to the generation of some element of creative or innovative activity that is peer reviewed and published in an appropriate form. Typically this involves research in any aspect of the nature and control of plant diseases and their impact on society. However, this also may include creative activity in any area relating our discipline to human society and its needs and/or to the development of new and innovative methods for teaching and extension in areas of expertise within plant pathology. To be considered scholarship, an activity must 1) lead to the creation of something that did not exist before; 2) must be validated by peers and by external sources, and 3) must exemplify one or more of the forms of discovery, integration, transformation, or application (see CFAES Faculty Reward System Guidelines for Annual Performance Review, Promotion, and Tenure). **Service** is expressed as: active participation in committees of the Department, College, or University; service to the profession and to professional organizations; and application of professional expertise in service to the community, state, and nation. In all cases, a high standard of Departmental and University citizenship is required as part of the service expectations for promotion and tenure. Citizenship is shown in terms of positive contributions to Departmental, College, and University committees; participation in Departmental activities; maintaining a high level of collegiality; and working towards the improvement and advancement of the Department, College, and University (see also Section IV.C, page 8). When faculty show special ability in service, this will be part of the consideration given during promotion and/or tenure review, but such special ability or performance in service will not relieve the candidate of demonstrating excellence in scholarship.

**B. Criteria for promotion and for tenure**

1. **Criteria: Promotion to rank of associate professor with tenure**
As specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6, tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor. The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on evidence that the faculty member: 1) has achieved excellence as a teacher and scholar; 2) provides effective service; and 3) can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to their specific appointment and the missions of the Department, College, and University. Every candidate will be held to a high overall standard of excellence, but the nature of the appointment (see Section IV.C, page 8) and assigned responsibilities will be of major importance in evaluating the candidate. That is, clear demonstration of excellence is essential in the areas central to the candidate's assigned responsibilities. A less than excellent performance in the area of primary responsibility cannot be counterbalanced by excellence in an area of lesser responsibility.

2. Criteria: Promotion to rank of professor

Promotion to the rank of professor is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member: 1) has a sustained record of excellence in classroom teaching, student advising, and/or extension (outreach) education; 2) has produced a significant and focused body of scholarship that is nationally or internationally recognized for its impact on the field of plant pathology or related areas of science; and 3) has demonstrated leadership in service. Individuals seeking promotion to full professor will be assessed in relation to the nature of their appointment (OSU general funds, OARDC, OSUE [see Section IV.C, page 8]) and assigned responsibilities. Exceptional performance and leadership in the areas with greatest responsibilities are required. The Department expects an individual that is worthy of promotion to full professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Promotion to professor will not result from simply performing adequately for a given number of years as an associate professor.

C. Procedures

1. General considerations

The Department conducts two peer reviews annually. The ANNUAL FACULTY PROGRAM REVIEW (see V, above) is a review of the academic programs for the previous calendar year of all faculty. The PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW is an assessment of all faculty who are not tenured full professors.

The purpose of the Department's promotion and tenure review is to obtain a thorough, critical, and objective evaluation of the progress of all promotion and tenure eligible faculty towards promotion and tenure. Procedures for promotion and tenure reviews follow the policies set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 of the University, the procedural guidelines established by the office of academic affairs, and the specific policies established by the College. All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed by the
eligible voting faculty (defined below), and by the Chairperson. Candidates will also be reviewed at the College and University levels. The Chairperson is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the decisions by the eligible faculty of the Department, the Dean of the college, and Executive Vice President and Provost (including the recommendation to the board of trustees).

2. Review procedures at the Department level

_DPT committee—responsibility and composition._ The Departmental Promotion and Tenure (DPT) committee is charged with: 1) evaluating annually all candidates for promotion and tenure, or promotion and making recommendations to the Chairperson on P&T actions, 2) advising the Chairperson on content of annual P&T letters to all assistant and associate professors; 3) presenting the case of candidates to the eligible faculty (defined below) for their consideration and vote on promotion and tenure, or promotion; 4) advising the Chairperson annually on the reappointment of all probationary faculty; and 5) preparing a report for the Chairperson describing the eligible faculty’s and DPT committee’s assessment of quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service of candidates being submitted to the College for promotion and tenure consideration. The DPT committee shall consist of four tenured professors, Chairperson (ex officio) and Department associate chair (ex officio). Terms on the committee are for 2 years, with two new members elected every year, and the two senior members rotating off the committee. Members of the committee are elected by all faculty (not just those eligible to vote on promotion) in the Department. An individual cannot serve for consecutive terms; a minimum of one year must elapse from completion of a term on the committee before a faculty member can be elected to serve another term. Normally two of the elected members are based on the Columbus campus and two on the Wooster campus. If availability prevents two individuals from each campus from serving, then at least one faculty member on the committee must be from each campus. The chair of the DPT committee is elected by committee members for a one-year term, but can be reelected for a second one-year term. Ex officio members cannot serve as chair. Each year, the DPT committee also elects one of its members (other than the committee chair) as the ‘Procedures Oversight Designee’. The two most recently elected members of the DPT committee serve the following winter as part of the Department’s Annual Faculty Program Review (FPR) Committee (see V, above); that is, these individuals serve a one-year term on the FPR in the middle of their two-year term on the DPT committee. New DPT committee members normally are elected the September prior to the start of new deliberations in June. If a member of the DPT committee cannot serve, due to illness or other cause, then the Chairperson shall appoint a replacement.

_Eligible faculty._ Except for probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured faculty members in the Department of higher rank than the candidate, excluding the Chairperson and associate chair, and members of the University administration. For tenure of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors excluding the Chairperson and associate chair, and members of the University administration. Eligible faculty with a conflict of interest (e.g., familial or comparable relationship with the candidate, business relationship with the candidate) will not vote.
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DPT committee meetings—annual evaluations. In early June of each year, the DPT committee starts its annual evaluation of candidates. All faculty members below the rank of professor and untenured professors are evaluated each year. The fourth year review of probationary faculty follows the same process as the review of all other faculty below the rank of tenured full professor, except that the Dean of the college must also approve the renewal of the appointment. A completely updated draft of the dossier for each candidate will be given to the DPT committee and made available to all faculty members in the Department at least 2 weeks prior to the deliberations of the DPT committee in June. All candidates must maintain an updated dossier in the format prescribed by the office of academic affairs. In addition, they must include their initial Position Description and all subsequent Annual Statements of Responsibilities and Expectations. Notification for the need of the draft dossier is given to the candidates by the Chairperson at least 2 months before the start of deliberations. The candidate has primary responsibility for preparing and maintaining a dossier documenting his or her career accomplishments, and for providing information on quality of teaching, scholarship, and service. The DPT committee and Chairperson will give advice on the proper preparation of the dossier.

The committee meets individually with every faculty member of the Department (both those eligible and not eligible to vote on promotion) to discuss the progress of all candidates. This is usually done in June. The purpose of these meetings is to obtain a peer evaluation of the accomplishments of each candidate in teaching, scholarship, and service. The candidates for promotion also meet with the DPT committee as part of this process to obtain their peer evaluations and for a presentation of their self evaluation. During this stage of the review, a report from the candidate’s teaching evaluation (TE) committee (see E.1, Documentation, below) is made available to the DPT committee. The candidate’s annual performance review letters and annual promotion and tenure review letters from the previous 3 years are made available to the DPT committee. The DPT committee will consider all of these discussions and all available documentation in arriving at its recommendations.

Solicitation of letters of evaluation. If it is time for mandatory review of probationary faculty (e.g., during the sixth year of the probationary period for assistant professors), or if sufficient accomplishments have been made for a faculty member not undergoing mandatory review (see below), outside letters of evaluation from peers shall be solicited. Evaluations from current or past students or from other clientele (e.g., growers, county agents, industry professionals) also may be solicited, as appropriate. The Chairperson has responsibility for obtaining letters of evaluation, based on names recommended by the DPT committee, the candidate, and his/her own judgement. No more than half of the letters in the final dossier can be from persons suggested by the candidate. The candidate can also suggest that certain individuals not be asked to write letters due to conflicts of interest or other legitimate causes. A minimum of five letters of evaluation will be obtained. The Chairperson shall follow University guidelines in wording the request for evaluation of the candidate. Evaluators may be asked to review different aspects of the candidate’s dossier, depending on the appointment of the individual and qualifications of the evaluator. For instance, if a candidate has appointments in OARDC and OSUE, different individuals may be asked to evaluate contributions in research and extension teaching. Evaluators will be given the most up-to-date draft of the candidate’s dossier and related documentation, such as reprints of journal articles.
or descriptions of teaching effectiveness. All solicited letters received are included in the dossier. Unsolicited evaluations are not included. The decision to solicit letters and continue with the review generally is made in June following the DPT annual evaluations.

**Non-mandatory review process.** In the case of faculty members not undergoing mandatory review, following evaluation of all promotion and tenure eligible faculty, members of the DPT committee come to agreement on whether each candidate's accomplishments are sufficient to warrant a full review and vote by the eligible faculty. The committee then informs the Chairperson of its recommendation. If the DPT committee recommends for or against full non-mandatory review of any probationary faculty member and the Chairperson agrees, the decision of the DPT committee is final. If the Chairperson disagrees with the DPT recommendation, a vote of the eligible faculty will be taken to decide if a full non-mandatory review will proceed. A majority positive vote of the eligible faculty will move a full non-mandatory review forward. In the case of associate professors, the same procedure will apply. In all cases, candidates are informed of the recommendation of the DPT committee regarding moving their case forward to a full review. Any faculty member not required to undergo mandatory review may decide that a full review (including solicitation of outside letters and putting forward the dossier for a vote of the eligible faculty) not be done, even if the DPT committee recommends that full review is warranted. In those cases, a full review is not initiated. If an associate professor makes a specific request in writing to the DPT for a full review, this request may be denied by this procedure for two successive years. However, if again in the third year this associate professor requests to the DPT that a full review be done, letters are solicited and the review moves forward even though the DPT committee continues not to recommend full evaluation. Normally, solicitation of letters, full review of the dossier, vote of the eligible faculty, and forwarding of the dossier to the Dean of the college are not done for associate or assistant professors with less than 5 years in rank. However, exceptional individuals with less time in rank can be fully evaluated and voted on by the eligible faculty if the DPT committee recommends that earlier promotion is reasonable.

**Annual voting on probationary faculty.** For all probationary faculty prior to the year of mandatory review, the DPT committee makes a recommendation to the Chairperson on renewal of the appointment. Nonrenewal of probationary faculty appointments must result from application of fourth year review procedures as specified in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(C)(3). If the DPT committee recommends renewal and the Chairperson agrees, the reappointment is approved. If the DPT committee recommends nonrenewal, a letter shall be written to the Chairperson outlining reasons for the negative recommendation on this case. If the Chairperson believes renewal is appropriate, regardless of the recommendation of the DPT committee, the reappointment is approved. If the Chairperson agrees with the DPT committee that nonrenewal may be appropriate a vote of the eligible faculty shall take place. If the DPT committee recommends renewal, but the Chairperson believes that nonrenewal may be appropriate, the case also shall be directed to the eligible faculty for a vote. *To conduct a vote on renewal*, the chair of the DPT committee distributes ballots to the eligible faculty, along with a copy of the letter from the DPT committee to the Chairperson and the most recent version of the dossier of the probationary faculty member. If less than a majority (50% + 1) of the voting eligible faculty recommend renewal of the appointment and the Chairperson agrees that nonrenewal is appropriate, or if the Chairperson
independently decides that nonrenewal is appropriate regardless of the vote of the eligible faculty, he writes letters to the probationary faculty member and Dean of the college to inform them of the numerical outcome of the vote and reasons for the decision. Then the entire dossier including these letters is sent to the Dean of the college who will make the final decision when there is a recommendation of nonrenewal for probationary faculty prior to the year of mandatory review. When probationary faculty undergo the “Fourth Year Review”, a vote of the eligible faculty is taken as above. Then, regardless of the decision, the entire dossier and a letter of assessment, which includes the result of the vote, is written by the Chairperson and submitted to the Dean of the college who must decide on approval or disapproval of the renewal of the appointment. Probationary faculty are notified each year in writing by the Chairperson regarding the decision on their appointment renewal, usually as part of the annual evaluation letter (see below).

Discussion and voting on final dossier of candidates. Once a final copy of the complete dossier is prepared for a faculty member eligible for promotion, including the letters of evaluation, the Chairperson makes the final dossier available to all eligible faculty for evaluation and vote. The Chairperson, or designee, verifies the accuracy of citations, the Position Description and annual Statements of Responsibilities and Expectations, and other aspects of the dossier. The dossier is available for at least one week. This is normally done in early September. Then, the DPT committee presents the case of the candidate for promotion in a meeting of the eligible faculty members. The presentation by the chair of the DPT committee, or one of the other DPT committee members designated by the committee chair, summarizes the dossier and gives the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The eligible faculty must judge performance against the original Position Description and the sequence of Annual Responsibilities and Expectations Statements. After a general discussion, the DPT committee distributes ballots to the eligible faculty and counts the votes. A 2/3 positive vote of the total eligible faculty present for the discussion and voting is required for a positive recommendation. The DPT committee then prepares a report on the faculty assessment, including the numerical vote of the eligible faculty, and a summary of the eligible faculty’s evaluation (based on the initial discussions with all faculty and subsequent discussion of the final dossier in the meeting of eligible faculty), and forwards the report to the Chairperson for inclusion in the dossier.

Evaluation letter by Department Chairperson and candidate’s potential response. The Chairperson then prepares a detailed written assessment of the candidate and his/her recommendation regarding promotion, or promotion and tenure, and includes this letter as part of the dossier package. As soon as the faculty report and Chairperson’s letter have been completed, the candidate is notified in writing by the Chairperson of the completion of the review by the Department and of the availability of the complete dossier package. The candidate must notify the Chairperson in writing within 5 calendar days of notification of the completion of the review whether or not he/she wishes to see a copy of the complete dossier package (including all internal and external reports and letters of evaluation). If the
candidate chooses to examine the complete dossier package, he/she may provide the
Chairperson with written comments on the Departmental review for inclusion in the dossier
package within 10 calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The DPT
committee and/or Chairperson may provide written responses to the candidate’s comments
for inclusion in the dossier package. Only one iteration of comments on the Departmental
level review is permitted.

Forwarding of the dossier. For mandatory review of probationary faculty, the
Chairperson shall forward the complete dossier package, with all internal and external
evaluations, candidate comments on the Department review, and DPT committee and/or
Chairperson responses to those comments, if any, to the Dean of the college. Forwarding
the dossier to the Dean of the college occurs regardless of the recommendations of the
eligible faculty or Chairperson for mandatory review of probationary faculty. For
nonmandatory review of candidates for promotion and tenure, or for promotion, once
external letters of evaluation have been sought only the candidate may stop the review
process (e.g., discussion and voting by the eligible faculty, letters by the DPT committee
and Chairperson, and forwarding of the dossier package to the Dean of the college). The
candidate may withdraw from review at any stage by so informing the Chairperson in
writing. If the review process has moved beyond the Department, the Chairperson shall
inform in writing the Dean of the college or the Executive Vice President and Provost, as
relevant, of the candidate’s withdrawal. Withdrawal from mandatory tenure review during
the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.

Annual promotion and tenure evaluation letters from Department Chairperson to all
faculty below rank of tenured full professor. Each year a letter is written to every faculty
member below the rank of tenured full professor that summarizes the DPT review for the
given year, whether or not a complete dossier package (including outside letters) is
prepared and a full review conducted. The letter is written by the Chairperson, with input
from all members of the DPT committee. The letter contains a constructive and candid
appraisal of the progress the candidate is making in teaching, research, and service. Areas
that need improvement are emphasized, with recommendations for achieving high quality
performance. The Chairperson delivers the letter to each faculty member and places a copy
in his/her personnel file. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the Dean of the college for
each probationary faculty member. Copies of the final letters are made available to
members of the DPT committee for their review, but are not retained by them.

D. Documentation

All candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate and document clear excellence in
teaching (degree granting or extension/outreach), research or other forms of scholarship, and
service. The nature and extent of the contribution will be commensurate with assigned responsibilities and the amount of time allocated for each activity.

1. Teaching

Documentation of teaching excellence for all candidates shall consist of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and a self evaluation. However, specific documents will depend on the type of teaching activity in which the candidate is involved. For instance, evaluation of extension outreach teaching will be substantially different from evaluation of credit-based classroom teaching. In all cases, however, excellence requires demonstrated high-level accomplishment for most of the following measures of teaching:

- Mastery of the subject matter
- Continuous growth in subject matter knowledge
- Ability to organize and communicate class material with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- Objectivity
- Contributions to curricula or program development
- Creativity in course or program development, methods of presentation and incorporation of new materials and ideas
- Capacity to enhance students’ awareness of the relationship between subjects studied, important problems, and other fields of knowledge
- Advising undergraduates, graduate students, and extension clientele
- Directing graduate and undergraduate research programs.

In addition to the above, the following measures of teaching performance are expected of extension teachers:

- An understanding of the needs for knowledge by outreach students/clients/users
- The ability to communicate effectively with outreach students
- The ability to anticipate the needs of outreach students and respond with appropriate educational activities
- The development and delivery of outreach education programs
- Changed practices, policies or behavior from outreach education
- The development of teaching materials
- Extension publications and juried presentations.

Teaching Evaluation committee—responsibility and composition. To ensure that a constructive and systematic review of teaching is performed, a Teaching Evaluation (TE) Committee will be appointed by the Chairperson for all promotion-and-tenure-eligible faculty. The TE committee consists of two tenured faculty members from the Department who are senior in rank to the candidate, and they will serve in this role for the duration of time that the person is in rank. That is, a TE committee will be formed for a newly-appointed faculty member and another TE
committee will be established when the faculty member is promoted to associate professor. A change in the committee membership may be approved by the Chairperson when a committee member is not available, or when a member or the candidate requests to the Chairperson (with cause) that the membership change. The functions of the TE committee will be to counsel with the candidate, coordinate the evaluation of his/her performance in teaching and extension education, make an annual report on his/her progress each June to the DPT committee, and assist and actively mentor the candidate in assembling pertinent evaluative information for inclusion in his/her dossier.

The TE committee has responsibility for working with the candidate regarding the ongoing systematic appraisal of teaching performance. Members of the TE committee work with the candidate over time to develop and implement a strategy for the evaluation of teaching (classroom or extension). That is, the TE committee will determine, after consultations with the candidate, the appropriate evaluations of teaching based on the appointment of the candidate. This is a proactive procedure in that many of the decisions on teaching evaluation methods will be made before the teaching is performed. The TE committee will provide a written report annually to the DPT committee during their deliberations each June.

Student evaluations of individual courses are required for every regular (credit-based) classroom course taught. University-supplied SEI evaluation forms will be used for all classes, although more specialized evaluation forms can be used to supplement university forms. The TE committee of the candidate will determine procedures for the distribution and collection of evaluation forms, and the compiling and comparison of results. Evaluation forms will be distributed by someone identified by the TE committee (not the candidate) and will be returned to the TE committee. The summary SEI report from the university should be given directly to the TE committee. Because extension (outreach) teaching is done in situations that are much more variable than classroom teaching, evaluation of extension (outreach) presentations will be done using the EEET instrument provided by OSUE where this is deemed appropriate by the TE committee. Where use of the EEET is deemed inappropriate, other approaches may be used as approved by the TE committee.

For faculty members with substantial classroom teaching responsibilities, additional means of student evaluation are appropriate, as decided by the TE committee. These may include exit interviews of undergraduate advisees and surveys of former students. Letters of evaluation from former graduate students may also be appropriate in many cases. The TE committee will select the students to provide the evaluations.

The TE committee takes responsibility for the oversight of the peer review of teaching. In this capacity, the TE committee may ask other faculty to observe the classroom and/or extension presentations, depending on the area of specialization of the candidate, and give a report to the TE committee, or members of the TE committee may do this directly. Peer evaluation of classroom teaching should include TE committee review of course materials, including syllabi, exams, and instructional material, as well as observations of classroom teaching. Course material may be sent to faculty at other universities in the same speciality for appraisal. These evaluations will be done as part of an organized plan, determined in the periodic meetings of the TE
committee with the candidate, rather than by haphazard appearance of evaluators at lectures. Representative lectures from all courses will be observed. Peer evaluation of extension (outreach) teaching includes TE committee review of extension publications (e.g., Newsletters, Fact Sheets, Bulletins, Electronic Media products, etc.), computer programs, teaching material (e.g., slides, overheads, electronic and computer demonstrations), and observations of extension presentations. Peer evaluations of teaching materials will also be solicited from extension faculty in other universities, if appropriate. Surveys of county agents or district specialists in OSUE, using evaluation instruments developed by OSUE, may provide information relevant for peer evaluation. However, county agents and district specialists can also be considered students of the candidate in that instructional material is often aimed at these individuals. Thus, flexibility must be shown in evaluation of extension teaching.

Other forms of teaching evaluation used by the TE committee may include assessment of the success of the candidate’s former graduate students and post-docs; extent to which teaching materials developed by the candidate have been adopted by faculty at other institutions; extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching; extent to which the candidate is requested to give invited lectures (including extension presentations) in other departments, or other universities, or states; membership on national teaching committees; and teaching awards.

A self-evaluation of teaching (classroom and/or extension) will be conducted through the preparation of a statement by the candidate of his or her approach to, and goals for, teaching; self-assessment of accomplishments; and a description of the strategies for improvement. A draft of this statement will be prepared after two years in rank and shared with the TE committee for evaluations and feedback. This self-evaluation statement should be revised at least every other year.

**Annual Teaching Evaluation letters.** As indicated above, each TE committee will provide a written report annually to the DPT committee during their deliberations each June. This is required every year, even if the candidate did not engage in any direct classroom or extension education efforts during that year. TE letters should address all teaching activities of the candidate since the last letter was written to the DPT committee. Assessments should be made wherever appropriate on any or all of the measures of teaching effectiveness listed above. These are outlined in the APT document of the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences in Section VI.A.1, and in the CFAES Faculty Reward System Guidelines.

Teaching Evaluation letters should be addressed to the entire DPT committee, listing the chair of the committee first and then the others by name. The original TE letter with signatures will be placed in each candidate’s official file maintained in the Columbus office. Copies of each TE letter will be distributed to all current members of the DPT committee for their use during the annual review process, but following completion of this process, all copies will be destroyed except for one set that will be maintained in the Wooster office. Each TE committee will give a copy of the TE letter to the candidate for whom the letter was written to provide annual feedback on evaluation of their teaching effectiveness. The TE committee should schedule a time to meet with the candidate to discuss points in the letter if either the committee members or the candidate
wishes to do so. Copies of TE letters WILL NOT be made available each year to the faculty at large during the annual evaluation process. Updated dossiers which are made available annually to all faculty members include only the “core” portion of the document which outlines accomplishments, but does not include evaluative material. However, when a case comes to the eligible faculty for P&T consideration, all TE letters will be made available to all eligible faculty. At that time, a series of TE letters will exist and progress in teaching effectiveness can be seen.

2. Scholarship

Excellence of scholarship is indicated by validation of the candidate’s work by their peers. For most faculty in the Department, the primary demonstration of scholarship is publication of results of scholarly activity in peer-reviewed scientific journals, books, and the invited presentation of research results at professional meetings or seminars. For some faculty members, other scholarly output may be as important as journal articles. Examples include patents and the development of products or processes used by University customers (e.g., plant cultivars and disease resistant germplasm, new disease management programs) or the development of peer-reviewed extension or pedagogical publications. Less traditional forms of scholarly excellence could include computer-assisted learning material or computer software that has been judged to be of high quality and has been adopted by others, development of products which break new intellectual ground and enjoy substantial adoption, or new efforts in distance education which are used by peer institutions or peer-validated by some other means. In all cases, documentation of the quality of scholarly contributions or impact of the work as validated by peers is essential.

An essential part of the dossier of a candidate is a listing of the publications and other scholarly works and the description of the contribution of the candidate to each item. Significance of the contributions is the key factor in the evaluations, not simply the order of authors in multi-authored publications. The quality and appropriateness of the publication outlets (e.g., journals) will be evaluated in the review. Flexibility must be given here in the evaluation because one peer-reviewed venue might be the most appropriate outlet for a given candidate based on the type of scholarly work being conducted, whereas another may be more appropriate for a different candidate. Quality, significance, focus, and depth of individual research publications or scholarly outputs and the overall program of scholarly activity, within the context of the candidate’s appointment, will be evaluated internally (through the deliberations of the DPT committee and discussions with Departmental faculty) and externally through letters of evaluation. Both the quantity and quality of scholarly work are important to document, as is the pattern of production of scholarly work during the probationary period or period since the last promotion.

Obtaining external funds for conducting research is an important component of a high-quality research program. Although obtaining funding from highly-competitive, peer-reviewed granting programs is one measure of quality of a candidate’s scholarly achievements, lack of funding from certain granting programs is not necessarily an indication of poor quality. That is, external funds are not obtained simply to demonstrate significance of the research, but to provide a means so that research can be done. All faculty have an obligation to obtain the necessary funding to support their research, but the source of the funding should be appropriate for their appointment
and nature of their studies.

Other measures of quality of scholarship include: invitations to speak at national and international scientific conferences, to give seminars or workshops at other universities, and to write book chapters or to edit books on areas of expertise; prestigious awards received; and membership and activity on regional and national research (or policy) related committees. Serving as an associate or senior editor of scientific journals and serving on review panels for national or regional competitive grants programs are further measures of scholarship quality, even though these can also be considered service functions.

External evaluation of scholarship is important for assessing the quality of the research conducted by a candidate. However, primary responsibility for assessing quality, and assessing statements made by external reviewers, rests with the Department.

A self evaluation of scholarship will be performed and included in the dossier. One approach to self evaluation is to describe the most significant accomplishments in scholarship (e.g., discoveries published in journal articles and books) over the past 5 years. Factors to consider include the relevance of scholarly work to the field, the “cutting edge” nature of the scholarly work, appropriate impact measures, productivity and/or efficiency of research and creative works, and the level of risk taking. This summary will be prepared initially after three years in rank and updated yearly for probationary faculty and every other year for nonprobationary faculty. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to share this summary with the DPT committee during the annual evaluation by submitting it with their dossier.

3. Service

All faculty members are expected to contribute actively to the governance of the Department, the College and the University. Documentation of service should include a listing and description of the candidate’s contributions to the general activities of the Department, College, University, and profession. This includes, but is not limited to, service on committees of the Department, College, or University, participation in Departmental faculty meetings, serving in supportive administrative roles, representing the University in service to the non-academic community, and serving in special roles such as with commodity groups, community development groups, youth support groups, etc. Documentation of quality or impact of the service is required. Examples include leadership of certain activities, demonstrated by chairing committees, as well as organizing national or international professional programs. Serving the profession by invitation or election, particularly as an officer or editor, at the state, regional, national, or international level are clear indicators of the quality of service.

As discussed previously in this document, citizenship within the Department is a critical component of service, and must be documented. High quality service and good citizenship require that the candidate works in a positive manner for the improvement of the Department and the services provided. Documentation of citizenship is obtained from the discussions with each faculty
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member during the annual evaluation of candidates (see VII.C.2).

Although service within the University can be evaluated by members of the Department, external evaluators may provide useful appraisal of service at the national or international level.

VIII. APPEALS

If a candidate believes that a nonrenewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of University rules and policies, then the candidate may appeal the decision. Procedures for appealing a decision are described in rule 3335-5-05(A)(1) of the Administrative Code.

IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

As specified in Faculty Rule 3335-6-05, in rare instances the Department may petition the Dean of the college to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who had been denied promotion and tenure the previous year. A faculty member previously denied promotion and tenure cannot request a seventh year review, cannot appeal the denial of a seventh year review, and cannot appeal a negative decision of a seventh year review, as specified in the Faculty Rule. Both the eligible faculty and the Chairperson must agree on a seventh year review before a petition can be made to the Dean of the college.

The DPT committee must first decide if a seventh year review should be recommended. Such a review will only be considered if substantial new information is obtained that raises questions about the original negative decision. If three of four (or two of three) of the DPT committee members vote positively to recommend such a review, the chair of the DPT committee distributes ballots to the eligible faculty for a vote. If two-thirds of the voting eligible faculty vote to consider a review, then this recommendation is given to the Chairperson. The Chairperson then writes a letter to the Dean of the college requesting a new review, if his/her recommendation also favors a seventh year review. If the Dean of the college and Executive Vice President and Provost approve the request, then a review during the seventh year is conducted. Approval for a new review must occur before the start of the seventh year of employment. This review follows the same guidelines as described above for the mandatory review of probationary faculty. 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.