

II. For Tenured Faculty

A. Classroom Teaching

1. Reviews will be obtained annually for faculty members who have teaching responsibilities for a given academic year. To initiate the process, the chair of the AAC will solicit from the faculty member the names of three faculty members who would be appropriate reviewers. From this list the AAC chair will select a single reviewer and inform the Department Chair of the appointment. The faculty member being reviewed will then supply the designated reviewer copies of all the appropriate support material (syllabus, handouts, tests, etc.).
2. The review process will proceed as described under the relevant portions of Section I above. These sections are: I.A.4.a,b,c,d, and e. The differences here are that the review will not involve a Mentoring Committee and only one classroom visit will be necessary. Other faculty and the Department Chair may be involved in the reviews as deemed appropriate by the faculty member conducting the review. The reviewed faculty member should meet with the reviewer to discuss informally where the areas of teaching effort can be improved. This analysis should include a review of Worksheets for teaching evaluation and SEI scores. The discussion may include other faculty who have participated in the review. No written record of these discussions is required.
3. The reviewer will also write a report summarizing the review. This report is to be addressed to the Department Chair with copy to the P&T Committee (for Associate Professors) and the faculty member reviewed. For Associate Professors, this letter will become a part of the P&T record. An effort should be made to focus on the positive aspects of the teaching effort. The reviewer will also inform the Chair of the AAC that the review has been completed.

B. Extension Teaching.

1. Tenured faculty who have Extension appointments or who regularly participate in Extension activities are encouraged to obtain reviews periodically. Faculty who anticipate application for promotion to full Professor should obtain appropriate reviews several years in advance of their application for promotion, regardless of their % appointment.
2. The faculty member will initiate the review process and provide the Chair of the Extension Committee with the names of three senior faculty who would be appropriate reviewers. From this list, the Chair of the Extension Committee will select a single reviewer and inform the Department Chair of the appointment. The faculty member being reviewed will then supply the designated reviewer with opportunities for program review during the upcoming year (i.e., Extension presentations to be given), and all appropriate support materials (fact sheets, visual aids, etc. See list under section I.B.6.). Completed EET forms and other evaluations of performance (see I.B.6a and e) will be returned to

the faculty member responsible for the review. The review process will proceed as described under the relevant portions of Section I. B. above. The difference here is that the review will not involve a Mentoring Committee. The reviewed faculty member will meet informally with the reviewer to discuss areas where the extension teaching effort can be improved. This discussion may include other faculty who have participated in the review. No written record of these discussions is required.

3. The reviewer will also write a report summarizing the review. This report is to be addressed to the Department Chair, with a copy to the P&T Committee (for Associate Professors), and the faculty member reviewed. An effort should be made to focus on the positive aspects of the teaching activity. The reviewer will also inform the Chair of the Extension Committee that the review has been completed.

Other evidence of the quality of instruction may include:

- Recognition or awards for distinguished teaching.
- Publications authored, co-authored or edited.
- Peer-reviewed publications designed primarily to communicate with other educators, e.g., journal articles or curricula, course innovations, recruiting, and student placement.
- Textbooks and chapters in textbooks or peer-evaluated books of readings.
- Articles, papers, reviews and other non-reviewed class reading materials.
- Updating instructional competence through workshops, study leaves, courses, industry visits, interaction with practitioners, and self-study.
- Leadership in development of courses and curricula which goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations.
- Any other pertinent information which the candidate may wish to submit.

Other evidence of the quality of outreach instruction may include:

- The number of outreach lessons or programs developed and the depth and breadth of subject matter included.
- The number and scope of courses of study (series of multiple lessons) developed.
- Participation in the development of a curriculum of study (series of courses).
- Involvement in program planning and development at the county, multi-county, state, regional, national and international levels, including the development of proposals for program funding and success thereof.
- Formal evaluations of extension meetings and programs and other outreach education activities by both clients and peers using standard forms developed by OSU Extension in the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.
- The number and scope of written teaching plans or programs, discussion guides, and related educational materials for use in teaching and for adoption by other outreach educators such as field extension faculty, vocational agriculture instructors, and industrial trainers.
- The number and scope of visual, audio, and computerized teaching aids (software packages), and evidence of use by other educators.
- Peer-evaluated publications designed primarily to communicate with other educators or to serve as basic references, e.g., extension bulletins, journal articles, books and book chapters, proceedings, etc.

- Popular and technical articles designed primarily to communicate timely subject matter directly to outreach students and the general public, e.g., articles in citable news magazines, newspapers, trade journals, house organs of businesses and associations, newsletters, etc.

2. Research and other creative works

For most faculty in the Department, the primary demonstration of scholarly works are written accounts that are published in peer-reviewed scientific journals or books, and presentation of results at professional meetings or invited seminars. For certain faculty members, especially those with a focus on mission-oriented research, research output other than peer-reviewed journal articles may be equally important. For promotion and tenure purposes especially, quality and usefulness of scholarly activities will be assessed by the department P&T Committee and faculty, letters from peers, evidence that research has been adopted or influenced peers, and/or users of research results. Other evidence that a faculty member is growing professionally and interacting constructively with students, colleagues, and the profession as a whole may be submitted as evidence in support of scholarship. Faculty are encouraged to include in their documentation of research performance a citation analysis of their publications and a listing of the impact factors for the journals in which they have published.

The following general hierarchy of research quality and productivity are recognized below; however, the relative importance and quality of scholarly contributions shall be based on their individual merit.

Documentation of scholarly activities includes:

a. Traditional publications

- Peer reviewed articles, germplasm releases, books and book chapters, monographs, and research bulletins based on original research have primary importance as evidence of research accomplishment.
- Textbooks, edited volumes, and other materials that are intended primarily to be tools for instruction are judged as research output to the extent that they present new ideas or constitute conceptual or empirical innovation.
- Review articles that require significant investigation on the part of the author and must pass a careful peer review.
- Published, invited, and selected papers presented at professional meetings.
- Other peer reviewed publications.
- Citable publications and reports that are not peer reviewed (e.g., proceedings, workshop papers).
- Book reviews written for journals reflect the author's status as a scholar but may also represent research output.

b. Non-published scholarly productivity

- Product development, equipment and process patents.
- Invited and volunteered research papers/poster presentations before professional societies.
- Extramural grant proposals and external funding. The relative merit of proposals and funding will be assessed according to the rigor of peer review and competitiveness of individual grants. The merit of all external funding (competitive and noncompetitive) will be based on evidence that the external funds have contributed directly to scholarly productivity.

- Awards and professional recognitions.
- Uncitable and unpublished papers and reports if the author(s) demonstrate(s) their quality and usefulness.
- Development of computer software or publication of instructional/informational computer resources (e.g., a World Wide Web site with online courses, technical information etc.)

3. Service

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 service in the following categories:

- a. Administrative services (includes but not limited to the following):
 - Departmental services - program coordinator and leader, member or chair of standing and ad hoc committees or task forces, and supervision of classified and A & P employees
 - College and University services - serving on college- or university-level faculty governance, search, standing, special and interdisciplinary research committees, task forces, reviewing materials, assisting at the administrative level for international and other programs.
- b. Student services (includes but not limited to the following):
 - Advising undergraduates, student clubs or other organizations, College Honors Committee
 - Serving on advisory committees of graduate students, advisory committees of graduate students in other departments, graduate school exam committees, university student committees (e.g., Judicial and Academic Misconduct).
- c. Professional services (includes but not limited to the following):
 - Serving as an officer, editorial board or committee member, or task force member of professional associations or societies
 - Peer-reviewing external manuscripts and grant proposals
 - Serving on regional and national research, teaching and extension committees; state and local task forces; state and local advisory committees; industry advisory committees and industry task forces.
 - Service to trade (clientele) organizations (e.g., officer of a trade association, executive secretary of a trade association). Member of board(s) of directors, consulting assignments.
 - Community service where professional expertise is rendered, e.g., judging activities, speaking on behalf of the University or profession.

VII. APPEALS

If a candidate believes that a decision for non-renewal of appointment or a 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 Faculty Rules 3335-5-05 and 3335-6-05 (A) of the Administrative Code.

VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

As specified in Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B), in rare instances the Department may petition the Dean 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 Rules.

The Departmental P&T Committee must first decide if a seventh year review should be recommended to the eligible faculty. Such a review will only be considered if substantial new information is obtained that raises questions about the original negative decision. If a majority of the P&T Committee members vote positively to recommend such a review, the chair of the P&T Committee will call a meeting of the eligible faculty, lead a discussion of the reasons for the review, and distribute ballots to the eligible faculty for a vote. Two-thirds of the eligible faculty must vote affirmatively for the seventh year review to proceed. If the faculty vote for seventh year review is affirmative, then this recommendation is given to the Department Chair. The Chair then writes a letter to the College Dean requesting a new review, if his/her recommendation is also in favor of a seventh year review. If the Dean 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 previously in this document 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 non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

IX. REVISION OF THE CRITERIA, PROCEDURES, AND GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENTS, ANNUAL REVIEWS, PROMOTION AND TENURE DOCUMENT

The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair will be responsible for keeping the document in conformance with College and University Guidelines and with other policies of the Department. Recommendations for revision of the document will be brought to the faculty by the Chair of the P&T Committee, after consultation with the Department Chair. Recommendations for changes must be provided to faculty 30 days in advance of a meeting at which a vote will be taken. A two-thirds majority of the eligible voting faculty at the faculty meeting will be required for approval of changes to the document. Following approval by the faculty, the Department Chair will send the proposed changes forward for approval by the College and University.

Instructor _____ Course _____

Evaluator _____ Date _____

Worksheet for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Instructors are invited to add categories that may be unique to her or his teaching activities.

Syllabus Content

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable
• General information (time, location, etc.)	___	___	___	___
• Instructor information (contact info.)	___	___	___	___
• Goals and objectives clearly stated	___	___	___	___
• Policies clearly explained <i>e.g.</i> : grading, make-up work, etc.	___	___	___	___
• Schedule for topics, assignments, tests, etc.	___	___	___	___
• Assignments clearly described	___	___	___	___
• Statement governing student conduct	___	___	___	___
• Format is professional in appearance	___	___	___	___

Tests

• Clarity of instructions/questions	___	___	___	___
• Match of content to course objectives	___	___	___	___
• Appropriateness of length	___	___	___	___
• Scheduled at reasonable intervals	___	___	___	___
• Tests appropriate level/s of cognitive learning	___	___	___	___
• Appropriate level of challenge	___	___	___	___

Assignments and Activities

• Clear instructions provided	___	___	___	___
• Helped develop understanding of new principles or concepts	___	___	___	___
• Reinforced material presented in lectures and/or text etc.	___	___	___	___
• Helped develop new skills	___	___	___	___
• Appropriate level of challenge	___	___	___	___

Other Teaching Materials & Activities

• Created teaching materials <i>e.g.</i> , notes, manuals, lab guides, slide-sets, website, etc.	___	___	___	___
• Teaching publications	___	___	___	___
• Developed 'new' teaching philosophy/approach	___	___	___	___
• Development of teaching skills <i>e.g.</i> attended teaching workshops, seminars, etc.	___	___	___	___

Comments on syllabus, tests, assignments, material, and activities:

Classroom Teaching

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable
I. Teacher Organization				
• Well-prepared for class	___	___	___	___
• Objectives for class clearly stated	___	___	___	___
• Learning activities well-organized	___	___	___	___
• Class remains focused on objectives	___	___	___	___
II. Instructional Strategies				
• Raises stimulating and challenging questions	___	___	___	___
• Facilitates discussion and group work	___	___	___	___
• Gives clear directions for group work and other forms of active learning	___	___	___	___
• Helps students apply theory to solve problems	___	___	___	___
• Provides an effective range of challenges	___	___	___	___
• Relates course content to practical applications	___	___	___	___
• Uses a variety of methods to explain or illustrate content	___	___	___	___
• Uses humor appropriately	___	___	___	___
III. Content				
• Knowledgeable about subject	___	___	___	___
• Provides sufficient content detail	___	___	___	___
• Relates course materials to practical applications	___	___	___	___
• Directs instruction at an appropriate level	___	___	___	___
IV. Presentation skills				
• Makes subject interesting and holds attention	___	___	___	___
• Board work is legible and organized	___	___	___	___
• Course handouts are effectively used	___	___	___	___
• Effectively uses visual aids	___	___	___	___
V. Rapport with students				
• Treats students respectfully and fairly	___	___	___	___
• Responds to questions effectively	___	___	___	___
• Demonstrates flexibility in responding to student needs, concerns, or interests	___	___	___	___
• Welcomes and respects student perspectives	___	___	___	___
• Does not exhibit or permit discriminatory behavior	___	___	___	___

Comments on Classroom Teaching:

Example of information provided by Extension Assistant Professor to facilitate Peer Review

I am writing to request that peer evaluations of my extension teaching performance be arranged for the Winter '01-'02 programming season. Per your previous suggestion, I have provided below a list of presentations that I deliver, at minimum, through February 2002 and peers from OSU/OSUE or elsewhere who may be in attendance. To my knowledge, the OSUE Evaluation of Effective Extension Teaching (EEET)-Peer form remains an accepted evaluation tool.

OSU Sweet Corn School

Friday November 16, 2001

2 presentations

Columbus, Piketon, Vandalia, Wooster, OH (video-link)

Mark Bennett, Brad Bergefurd, Mary Donnell, Doug Doohan, Jim Jasinski, Bob Precheur, Mac Riedel, Celeste Welty

Greenhouse Growers Meeting

Thursday November 29, 201

Seville, OH (CropKing, Inc.)

Mary Donnell

Washington/Meigs County Vegetable School (tentative)

Wednesday December 12, 2002

Washington State Community College; Marietta, OH

Eric Barrett, Hal Kneen, Mac Riedel, Celeste Welty

Muck Crop School (tentative)

Thursday or Friday January 17 or 18, 2002

Willard, OH

Dough Doohan, Casey Hoy, Sally Mille4r Bob Precheur, Mac Riedel, Celeste Welty

MidAtlantic Fruit and Vegetable Convention

Tuesday January 29, 2002

Hershey, PA

2 presentations

Mel Henninger (Rutgers), Bill Lamont (PSU), Rikki Sterrett (VTU), Celeste Welty

Ohio fruit and Vegetable Growers Congress

Thursday and Friday February 7 and 8, 2002

Toledo, OH

4 presentations (Potato, Processing Crops, and Truck Crops sessions)

Mark Bennett, Brad Bergefurd, Mary Donnell, Dough Doohan, David Francis, Dick Funt, Jim Jasinski, Diane Miller, Sally Miller, Bob Precheur, Mac Riedel, Joe Scheerens, Celeste Welty

Southwest Ohio Fruit and Vegetable School (tentative)

Thursday February 21, 2002

Morrow Vineyards, Morrow, OH (Warren County)

Tools available for evaluation of Extension teaching:

- Web site: www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~pde/pdeEEET.html
- Cover Sheet for EEET's
- Group EEET form
- Peer EEET form
- Expert EEET form