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CRITERIA, PROCEDURES, AND GUIDELINES FOR
APPOINTMENTS, ANNUAL REVIEWS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

DEPARTMENT OF HORTICULTURE AND CROP SCIENCE

I. PREAMBLE

The guidelines and procedures contained in this document are supplemental to those established by the OSU Office of Academic Affairs; the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, and those outlined by Faculty Rules, Chapter 3335-6: Additional Rules of the University Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure. In the context of the missions of the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences and the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science, this document establishes the criteria and procedures for 1) faculty appointments, 2) faculty promotion and tenure, and 3) rewards, including salary increases. These criteria and procedures were in accordance with the principles set forth in the Faculty Rule 3335-6-01:

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 paragraph (H) of rule 3335-6-03 of the Administrative Code 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 of the Administrative Code 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 of the Administrative Code 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, or Vietnam-era veteran status, or sexual orientation. (B/T 10/5/84, B/T 4/8/88, B/T 11/2/90, B/T 5/3/96).
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II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The criteria and standards of evaluation for faculty performance described in this document reflect the Department’s mission:

*The mission of the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science is to discover, synthesize, and communicate knowledge about plants and their uses for the benefit of the people of Ohio and the world. The mission is fulfilled through research and educational programs that link advances in fundamental and applied knowledge of food, feed and ornamental plants to improvement in the quality of life and of the environment. These programs provide education and service to students, producers, allied industries, professional groups and society.*

Faculty in the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science are dedicated to the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge that advances the sciences and professions involving plants and their environment. In an effort to promote the highest quality of scientific and professional conduct among its members, the Department endorses as its philosophy the following principles which represent the basic values of our profession:

Faculty shall:
1. Uphold the highest standards of scientific investigation and professional comportment, and an uncompromising commitment to the advancement of knowledge.
2. Honor the rights and accomplishments, and properly credit work and ideas of others.
3. Avoid conflicts of interest.
4. Demonstrate social responsibility in scientific and professional practice by considering whom their scientific and professional activities benefit, and whom they neglect.
5. Provide honest and impartial advice on subjects about which they are informed and qualified.
6. As mentors of the next generation of scientific and professional leaders, strive to instill these ethical standards in students at all educational levels.

III. APPOINTMENTS

In accordance with its own mission (shown above), the mission of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, and that of The Ohio State University “to attain international distinction in education, scholarship, and public service,” the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science will strive to appoint faculty members who work together in goal-oriented teams to provide the highest quality programs possible in teaching, research, and extension. To qualify for faculty status, in general, means that one should teach (profess) and contribute to the advancement of knowledge through scholarly inquiry. Each faculty member is expected 1) to achieve excellence and national recognition in the areas of teaching, research, or extension, and demonstrate competence in the other areas relevant to his/her appointment as well as 2) contribute to the intellectual life of the Department, College, University and profession through service.
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A. CRITERIA

Criteria for appointment of regular and auxiliary faculty in the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science were established in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02: Criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure and are outlined below.

1. Regular faculty

Regular faculty in the Department include persons with the rank and title of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor with a compensated appointment in the Department and a total regular faculty appointment in the University of at least 0.5 FTE. Such faculty may also have a compensated faculty appointment in another department or other academic unit (i.e. are “joint appointees”). The Department also considers regular faculty from other departments to whom it grants zero time courtesy titles to have regular faculty status in the Department. The responsibilities and rights of the regular faculty are governed by the Faculty Rules and by the Department’s Pattern of Administration.

a. Departmental budget appointments (tenure-track faculty)

Appointment decisions on regular faculty positions in the Department, as defined in rule 3335-5-19 of the Administrative Code, are based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor is an earned doctorate in horticulture, crop science, or a closely related field of study. In addition, the regular faculty of the Department must concur that the candidate has a record of scholarly achievement that is likely to lead to the candidate attaining tenure and moving through the faculty ranks.

Probationary periods of regular faculty appointments are established in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, Probationary service, duration of appointments for regular faculty and are outlined below:

• 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.

• Exclusions may be granted under Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, paragraph D (Exclusion of time from probationary periods), which provides for time to be excluded from the probationary period for the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six, personal illness, care of sick or injured persons, or other factors beyond a faculty member’s control that significantly interfered with productivity. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a non-renewal notice has been issued. The maximum amount of time that can be excluded is one year for an instructor, two years for an assistant professor, and one year for an associate professor except in extraordinary circumstances.

• A new appointment as professor or associate professor will generally include granting of tenure. A probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science and the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. For a petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided.
regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. A mandatory review for
tenure will occur in the final year of the probationary period. The person involved will be informed
by the end of the review year whether tenure will be granted at the beginning of the subsequent year.
If tenure is not granted, a terminal year of employment is offered. All appointments to the rank of
associate professor or professor require prior approval of the executive vice president and provost.

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

b. No-salary appointments

No-salary regular faculty affiliation with the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science carries the
expectation of significant contribution to the department, equivalent to the teaching of one three credit
course each year, or equivalent service in research, extension, and international programs. All no-salary
regular faculty will have their responsibilities and their general expectations outlined prior to their
appointment. In general, they are expected to attend and participate in Departmental faculty meetings,
seminars, and programs and to contribute tangibly and collaboratively, including their occasional
physical presence, to the teaching, research, extension and service activities of the Department.

In general, regular no-salary faculty are eligible to:

- Co-advise graduate students in accordance with their faculty status.

- Teach undergraduate and graduate level courses.

- Attend and participate in faculty meetings, serve on Departmental committees and represent the
  Department on University, College, OARDC, Extension and professional committees where
  appropriate.

No-salary appointments will be reviewed annually. The purpose of this review will be to assess the
faculty member’s record of contributions to the Department and to guard against no-salary appointments
becoming courtesy appointments for title only, with no significant contribution to Departmental
programs. The review will be conducted by the Department Chair and, in alternate years, by the faculty.

To implement the latter review, the P&T chair will request from no-salary appointees a listing of their
contributions in teaching, research, extension, and service to the Department during the past two years.
The P&T Committee will discuss these contributions and will make a recommendation to
the faculty at large regarding re-appointment or termination of the appointment. Recommendations of
the P&T Committee will be subjected to a vote of the faculty (see Sect. II of the Pattern of
Administration for voting procedures).

Following satisfactory review, the Department Chair will renew the appointment.
2. Auxiliary faculty

Auxiliary faculty include faculty with visiting and adjunct titles, faculty with regular titles whose total University faculty appointment is less than 50%, and lecturers. Visiting faculty are usually, but not necessarily, faculty on temporary professional leave from other academic institutions. Adjunct faculty status may be granted, as appropriate to research scientists, government scientists and other allied professionals who contribute significant uncompensated academic services to the Department.

Auxiliary faculty affiliation with the Department carries the expectation of significant contribution to the department, equivalent to the teaching of one three credit course each year, or equivalent service in research, extension, and/or international programs. Auxiliary faculty are not eligible for tenure and any time spent as an auxiliary appointee will not count toward tenure in the event the auxiliary faculty member is appointed to a tenure-track position within the department following a national search. All auxiliary faculty will have their responsibilities outlined prior to their appointment but will be expected to participate in Departmental faculty meetings, seminars, and programs and to contribute tangibly and collaboratively to the teaching, research, extension and service activities of the Department.

Auxiliary faculty, except adjunct faculty, may be hired and compensated on a temporary basis to perform a specific service within the Department as the need arises. Thus, the duties and responsibilities of the auxiliary faculty member are usually agreed upon as a condition of employment by the Department.

Auxiliary faculty, other than adjunct faculty, are eligible to:

- Serve on graduate student committees in accordance with their graduate faculty status.
- Teach undergraduate and graduate level courses (the latter only if approved by the Graduate School upon recommendation of the Departmental Graduate Studies Committee).
- Attend and participate in faculty meetings, serve on departmental committees and represent the Department on University, College, OARDC, Extension and professional committees where appropriate.

Adjunct faculty are eligible to:

- Serve on graduate student committees in accordance with their graduate faculty status.
- Teach undergraduate and graduate level courses.
- Attend and participate in faculty meetings, serve on departmental committees and represent the Department on University, College, OARDC, Extension and professional committees where appropriate.
- Serve on search committees for regular faculty.
- Serve as project leaders and principal investigators on funded proposals.

Adjunct faculty will be reviewed annually. The purpose of this review will be to assess the faculty member’s record of contributions to the Department and to guard against adjunct appointments becoming courtesy appointments for title only, making no significant contribution to Departmental programs. The review will be conducted by the Department Chair and, in alternate years, by the faculty.

To implement the latter review, the P&T chair will request from adjunct faculty a listing of their contributions in teaching, research, extension, and service to the Department during the past two years. The P&T Committee will discuss these contributions and will make a recommendation to the faculty at
large regarding re-appointment or termination of the appointment. Recommendations of the P&T Committee will be subjected to a vote of the faculty (see Sect. II of the Pattern of Administration for voting procedures).

Following satisfactory review, the Department Chair will renew the appointment.

3. Emeritus faculty

Retired faculty of the University who have served previously as regular tenured faculty in the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science are eligible for appointment as emeritus. Emeritus faculty have no-salary appointments in the Department or Horticulture and Crop Science. Emeritus appointments do not require a formal annual review. Emeritus faculty may not vote in the governance of the Department or participate in regular faculty appointment, promotion and tenure decisions. Office, laboratory, and other facilities of the University may be provided to emeritus faculty members, depending on the availability of such facilities and the needs of the individual. All decisions regarding space and facilities allocation to emeritus faculty will be made by the Chair (Columbus) or Associate Chair (Wooster) of the Department, and the use of departmental resources for such purposes will be evaluated yearly by the chair. Emeritus faculty may be hired and compensated on a temporary basis to perform a specific service within the Department as the need arises. No annual reappointment is necessary for emeritus faculty. (See page 14 for appointment procedures.)

B. PROCEDURES

1. Regular faculty

a. Departmental budget appointments (tenure-track faculty)

Hiring of regular faculty in tenure-track positions and their accompanying job responsibilities shall be made in accordance with the Department’s strategic plan. The Executive Advisory Committee, with coordination and input from the Department Chair, is responsible for monitoring and planning for faculty additions and replacements and major resource needs for the Department and recommending staffing plans to the faculty at large. All decisions relating to future faculty staffing and filling of vacant faculty positions shall be brought before the entire faculty for discussion and resolution. The Chair shall request from the Dean and appropriate members of the administrative cabinet of the College the authorization to fill positions.

The Department Chair will appoint a search committee composed of four Department faculty to conduct a national or international search for faculty positions unless there is faculty and administrative agreement to reassign an incumbent faculty member to a new position or appointment distribution. Faculty from both the Columbus and Wooster campuses will be included on the search committee, and an additional (fifth) committee member from another academic unit supporting activities relevant to the position being filled may be requested to serve on the committee. A representative from industry may also be requested to serve. The Department Chair will appoint one of the search committee members to serve as chairperson, and the committee will develop a position description that must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty. The Department Chair will submit the faculty-approved position description and a statement of justification 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. The position will be advertised in a manner that will gain national and international exposure, and special effort 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 the applicant review process. Application files will be secured but accessible to the Department faculty for their review. Based on their own views and discussions and input from the faculty at large, the search committee shall screen all applicants, seek relevant additional information from other sources as appropriate, and recommend to the Chair the top candidates (usually 3 or 4) to be interviewed. Interviews shall be open to all faculty, staff, students, college administration, and interested or impacted private groups who are beneficiaries of the relevant Departmental program.

The Department Chair and search committee chairperson will coordinate the interview schedules for the final candidates. Interview procedures will include visits to both the Columbus and Wooster campuses, and will consist of 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 Department faculty to meet individually or in small groups with each candidate. The Chair will solicit opinion and reaction from administrators that were contacted during the interview process and share that information with the faculty during the discussion phase prior to faculty voting on the candidates.

Following completion of all interviews, the Chair will call a meeting of the entire faculty at which time the search committee will make its recommendation to the faculty. The faculty will discuss the search committee's recommendation, and after full discussion, ballots will be distributed to the entire voting-eligible faculty, including those not present at the meeting. Faculty eligibility and voting procedures for offers of appointment to tenure-track faculty candidates will follow those for decisions on promotion and tenure candidates as outlined in section VI.B.1. of this document, with the exception that two members of the search committee will distribute the ballots and will tally the final vote. Only regular tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote on decisions regarding offers of appointment, fourth year reviews, and promotion and tenure of other regular tenure-track faculty members. A recommendation to offer an appointment to a candidate for a regular tenure-track faculty position must be approved by a positive vote of two-thirds or more of the eligible faculty. If the search committee's initial recommendation is not approved, the search committee will make an alternative recommendation or reopen the candidate search process.

Part-time faculty appointments will be approved in accordance with the same procedures as applied to new faculty appointments except that a Departmental search committee will not initiate the process. Normally, such appointments are requested by another academic department or by the invitation of the Department Chair. Credentials must be submitted to the faculty and an interview, seminar or other mode of evaluation must occur with a recommendation for approval or denial submitted by the faculty to the Chair. This process should occur at the same time the candidate is interviewed by his/her tenure-initiating unit where Horticulture and Crop Science faculty would be directly involved in the interview process, but if the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science is not involved at that time, then a separate evaluation process must be initiated by the Department.
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Candidates for some faculty positions may be selected through the actions of an Interdisciplinary Program of the University, using procedures approved for that particular program. A candidate from the Interdisciplinary Program can request academic appointment (i.e., "tenure-initiating-unit" appointment) in the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science, and such a request must include a copy of the curriculum vita of the candidate, and a letter outlining the reasons for the request. Subsequently, the Chair of the Department will call a meeting of the faculty to discuss the candidates, and voting and final selection will follow the same procedures as outlined above for other tenure-track regular faculty.

Within two months after a new faculty member begins work, the Chair will assign the new faculty member a Mentoring Committee consisting of three tenured regular faculty whose single role is to provide information, support, and candid feedback to the faculty member during the probationary period. It is expected that the Mentoring committee will meet with the new faculty member at least twice per year to discuss progress of the candidate in establishing a strong program and progress toward tenure and promotion. Following each meeting of the Mentoring Committee, the committee chair will provide a written report of the meeting to the Department Chair and Associate Chair.

The Department P&T Committee and the Mentoring Committees have similar long-term objectives but will operate independently to assist untenured faculty prior to formal P&T review. The two committees may exchange their analyses of the progress of the new faculty member, but they are not required to do so. Members of Mentoring Committees are obligated to step back into their roles as individual faculty members during the faculty discussion and voting phases of fourth year reviews and promotion/tenure decisions. That is, the Mentoring Committee is not to serve as an advocate for the candidate during the formal promotion and tenure process.

b. No-salary appointments

No-salary regular faculty are considered for faculty affiliation in one of two ways: by invitation of the faculty or Chair because of an individual’s academic stature and potential to collaborate and contribute to the subdisciplines and programs of the Department or by an individual’s or administrative unit’s request to be affiliated with the Department because of their academic interests and potential to contribute to the Departmental programs.

No-salary regular faculty appointments will be approved in accordance with the same procedures that apply to tenure-track regular faculty appointments except that a Departmental search committee will not initiate the process. The candidate’s credentials must be submitted to the faculty and an interview, seminar, or other mode of evaluation must occur with a recommendation for approval or denial submitted to the faculty by the Chair. A positive vote of two-thirds or more of the eligible faculty is required for approval of no-salary regular faculty appointments. If possible, the evaluation process should occur at the same time the candidate is interviewed by his/her tenure-initiating or budget unit where Horticulture and Crop Science faculty would be directly involved in the interview process. An independent interview and/or evaluation process should be initiated if the candidate was unavailable for such an evaluation when first appointed in his/her tenure-initiating or budget unit.

Caution will be exercised in having the Department become the tenure-initiating unit for faculty not paid with Departmental funds, because the Department and/or College is liable for the salary of such an individual if financial exigency were to occur in his/her budget unit (e.g., administrative units, contracted programs within the University that are budgeted from soft funds, etc.). The Chair should
have a clear understanding in writing with the College/OARDC/OSUE administration as to any financial, space, or facility obligations to no-salary regular faculty.

2. Auxiliary faculty

Auxiliary faculty are considered for faculty affiliation in one of two ways: by invitation of the faculty or Chair because of an individual’s professional stature and potential to contribute to the academic and service programs of the Department or by an individual’s or administrative unit’s request to be affiliated with the Department because of their professional interests and potential to contribute to the discipline through the Department and its programs. A positive vote of two-thirds or more of the eligible faculty is required for approval of all auxiliary faculty appointments. Auxiliary faculty appointments will be reviewed annually.

a. Visiting faculty

For visiting faculty, the Chair will submit the request and credentials of the applicant to the faculty for approval. Usually the visiting faculty title is applicable to faculty members from other universities or institutions who have either requested or been invited to affiliate with the Department on a temporary basis for a specific duty or assignment.

b. Adjunct faculty appointments

i. Requested appointments

The appointment of adjunct faculty for those requesting adjunct status should parallel the appointment procedure for hiring regular faculty. All requests by adjunct faculty candidates should be addressed to the Chair, and requests should consist of a letter explaining the rationale for the proposed affiliation, what contributions can be expected, and documentation of the appropriate credentials for academic affiliation. In lieu of a search committee, the Chair will appoint an ad hoc Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Committee for each candidate. The Evaluation Committee will review the candidate’s credentials and establish the areas and potential for the candidate’s contribution to the discipline. Where possible, other institutions, organizations, or academic units should reciprocate and include regular faculty of the Department in their own search and interview process in anticipation of adjunct affiliation of an individual with the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science. This process should also allow for the candidate to present a seminar to the faculty and for the faculty to interview the candidate. The Evaluation Committee will make its recommendation on both appointment and rank to the Department Chair. The Chair will submit a recommendation to the faculty for a discussion and vote with input from the Evaluation Committee.

ii. Invited appointments

Senior scientists transferred to OSU or professionals affiliated with other institutions may contribute significantly to Departmental programs. Likewise, retired scientists, teachers, extension personnel, and other professionals with academic credentials may have relocated in the area. Such individuals, as well as regular faculty in other academic units, may add greatly
to the talents, prestige, and programs in the Department and may thus be invited to affiliate
with the Department through appointment as adjunct faculty. For such individuals brought to
the attention of the Department, the Chair will appoint an Evaluation Committee to conduct a
preliminary assessment of the candidate’s qualifications and/or credentials for affiliation
before the candidate is notified of his or her potential candidacy. If the preliminary
assessment is positive, then the candidate will be invited to submit the requisite credentials for
consideration by the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee will make a
recommendation on both appointment and rank (i.e. adjunct assistant professor, adjunct
associate professor, or adjunct professor) to the Chair, and the Chair will then submit a
recommendation to the faculty and allow for the Evaluation Committee to report to the faculty
and full discussion to ensue prior to the vote.

iii. Senior departmental Administrative and Professional (A&P) personnel

Senior rank Departmental A&P personnel, including research scientists, senior research
associates, and senior extension associates, are eligible for adjunct appointments in the
Department. Adjunct faculty appointments within the Department of Horticulture and Crop
Science are often valuable to the individual and to the Department by permitting these
qualified staff members to serve in the graduate program, pursue external funding as principal
investigators, and serve in a variety of other roles within the Department. Their appointment
to the rank of adjunct faculty should parallel the appointment procedure for hiring regular
faculty. All requests should be addressed to the Chair. The request should consist of a letter
from the candidate outlining the rationale for the adjunct appointment, what contributions can
be expected, and the appropriate credentials for academic affiliation. The Chair will appoint
an ad hoc Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Committee for each candidate to review the candidate’s
credentials and establish the potential for discipline contribution and expectations of the
position. The Committee will organize a seminar by the candidate and a meeting of the
candidate with the faculty. The Chair, with input from the Evaluation Committee, will submit
a recommendation to the faculty for a discussion and vote. The Chair will forward approvals
to the College and University for official approval of the appointment. Where possible, the
process just described should be part of the search process for new senior A&P hires when it
is anticipated that adjunct faculty status will be requested in the future.

3. Emeritus faculty

Appointments as emeritus faculty are made by special request from the retired or retiring regular faculty
member to the Department. Typically, the request is in the form of a letter to the Department Chair,
who then conducts a vote of the full faculty for approval of the appointment. A positive vote of two-
thirds or more of the eligible faculty is required for approval of emeritus appointments. The Department
Chair will then notify in writing the retired faculty member and the Dean of the College regarding the
outcome of the vote.
IV. ANNUAL REVIEWS

Evaluation of faculty by unit administrators is required by Rule 3335-3-35, and every faculty member must have an annual performance review. The annual review is the primary means by which the faculty performance and achievement are evaluated, and serves as a basis for 1) formal communication between the Department Chair and faculty member regarding accomplishments of the previous year and plans for the next year, 2) a component in the determination of annual merit salary recommendations, 3) assisting faculty in professional development, 4) calling attention to performance problems where they exist, 5) praising exceptional performance, and 6) for untenured regular faculty, serving as a component of monitoring progress toward tenure. The Department Chair will inform faculty members when they receive their annual review of their right to review their primary personnel file maintained by the tenure initiating unit and to place in that file a response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file.

A. PROCEDURES

1. Probationary faculty – fourth-year review

All non-tenured faculty below the rank of associate professor will be reviewed during their fourth year of appointment by the P&T Committee and the salaried, tenured faculty. Reviews for promotion and/or tenure will be made at the time these considerations are required or deemed appropriate; generally, the deadline for submission of these materials will be in August, to coincide with the usual Autumn schedule for Promotion and Tenure deliberations.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (C)(3) requires that the fourth year review follow the same procedures as the sixth year review for promotion and tenure (see section VI.B.3. of this document) except that external evaluations are optional and review by the College P&T committee shall be optional in all cases where both the Department and Dean approve renewal of the appointment. It is the responsibility of the P&T Committee to conduct a preliminary review of the dossier and to provide suggestions for improvement in the presentation of the record of accomplishments. The dossier will be made available to faculty for their review for a period of two weeks (ten working days) prior to a faculty meeting. The Chair of the P&T Committee will arrange for the faculty meeting at which the record of the faculty member will be reviewed and discussed and a vote by secret ballot will be taken. See section VI.B.1. for voting procedures.

A recommendation for reappointment of probationary regular faculty candidates undergoing fourth year review must carry a positive vote of two-thirds or more of the regular tenured faculty. Following the faculty meeting to consider the case, a report of the faculty assessment, including both strengths and weaknesses, will be prepared by the Department’s P&T Committee, made available for review by the eligible faculty, discussed and revised by the P&T Committee if necessary, and forwarded to the Department Chair for inclusion in the dossier along with the numerical vote of the faculty. Following the vote of the faculty, the Chair will prepare his/her own separate written assessment of the case and recommendation for the Dean for inclusion in the dossier.

As soon as the faculty report and Chair’s letter/report have been completed, the faculty member will be notified in writing by the Chair of the completion and results of the Department review and of the availability of the faculty and Chair reports. A copy of these reports shall be made available to the
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faculty member upon request. The faculty member may provide the Chair with written comments on the Department review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The Chair or the Department P&T Committee may provide written responses to the faculty member’s comments for inclusion in the dossier, but only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted. The dossier is then forwarded to the Dean. The Dean of the College is the final decision maker for the fourth year review. If the faculty member does not become a candidate for tenure, the faculty appointment will not be renewed after the end of the fifth year.

2. Tenured faculty

At the end of each calendar year and prior to February 15, every tenured faculty member (including auxiliary faculty) shall provide the Department Chair with a report of accomplishments and plans for the coming year, as requested. Each faculty member should also have on file with the Department a current CV. The Chair shall meet with every regular faculty member to discuss the faculty member’s performance, goals, and plans as outlined in the faculty member’s annual report. The faculty member must receive from the Chair a written evaluation regarding performance and future plans as well as the recommended salary adjustment for the following year and the rationale for the adjustment.

3. Untenured faculty

At the end of each calendar year and prior to February 15, untenured faculty shall provide the Department Chair with a report of accomplishments and plans for the coming year, as requested. Each faculty member should also have on file with the Department a current CV. The Department Chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs Dossier outline (http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/xi_dossier.html) to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. The Department Chair shall meet with every untenured faculty member to evaluate the faculty member’s performance and future goals and plans. Following this meeting, the untenured faculty member must receive written feedback regarding performance and future plans as well as the recommended salary adjustment for the following year and the rationale for the adjustment. A copy of the annual review letter for each probationary faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean of the College.

The Departmental P&T Committee shall also review each untenured faculty member’s performance and productivity annually and provide written feedback to the faculty member as to his/her strengths and weaknesses. This review will be based on the same materials submitted for the Chair’s review of performance and will be completed within two months following the deadline for submission of the materials.

If the P&T Committee and the Department Chair question the desirability of contract renewal of an untenured faculty member, the case should be put before the salaried, tenured faculty and procedures outlined for the fourth year review followed. Following the vote and recommendation of the tenured faculty, the Chair will again assess the case. If the Chair recommends non-renewal of the appointment following the review by tenured faculty, the comments process (see VI.B.2, page 23) must occur and the case must be forwarded to the Dean for College level review. As with fourth year reviews, the Dean’s decision is final.
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V. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. CRITERIA

Merit raises will be based on the amount and quality of productivity and individual achievements as a combination of last year's performance coupled with productivity in recent years in the areas of teaching, research, extension, and service as outlined in the Department's Mission (section II) and general criteria outlined in section VI.A.1. of this document. As a faculty member of a comprehensive university, it is expected that each faculty member in the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science will contribute to multiple components of the Department's teaching-research-extension-service mission, even though the relative contribution to each will vary with the faculty member's responsibilities and goals. Merit salary recommendations are subject to revision upon conferring with the Dean and appropriate College administrators for final salary budget approval.

In addition to the teaching, research, extension, and service expectations placed on faculty, citizenship and collegiality will be a component of annual evaluation. Citizenship and collegiality includes contributing to the academic life of the Department through participating in departmental activities including seminars, invited speaker programs, faculty meetings, committee meetings, and student activities where faculty are invited. Faculty members are also expected to demonstrate respect and responsible behavior toward peers, staff, students, and clientele of the Department.

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 not deviate from normal annual review procedures and provide to the Department Chair an annual report of accomplishments and plans for the coming year, as requested.

B. PROCEDURES and DOCUMENTATION

In establishing annual salary recommendations for faculty, the Chair uses productivity and performance information obtained from the faculty member's annual report of accomplishments and goals for the future (tenured faculty) or Dossier for Promotion and Tenure (untenured faculty), consultations with the Chairs of the Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies Committees, personal observation and evaluation of program performance and productivity during the year, and feedback from students, peers, clientele, professional associates, and administrators. In the case of those faculty involved in international programs, evaluation (in addition to the annual report) is obtained from project director and the Director for International Programs.

C. OTHER COMPENSATION FOR PERFORMANCE

Decisions regarding allocation of Departmental resources to individual faculty as support for their research, teaching and/or extension programs will be made by the Chair and based on merit as described above for salary increases. Departmental resources include laboratory and office space, Departmental equipment, technical support staff, and allocated Departmental operating funds.
VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure, and promotion to full professor are based on convincing evidence that a faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher and scholar. The policies, procedures, and criteria pertaining to the awarding of tenure and promotions in faculty rank are set forth in Chapter 3355-6 of the Rules of the University Faculty.

As members of a learned profession, each faculty member in the department has a tripartite responsibility: 1) to disseminate knowledge, whether through resident instruction, among peers, or to extension and outreach clientele, 2) to generate knowledge through scholarly efforts, and 3) to provide service to the Department, College, University and profession. While the research expectations (quantity) vary with appointment, the quality of one's research productivity should be high. Each faculty member should develop a research focus area - one that he or she should be known for, regardless of his or her appointment distribution. In the context of evaluating teaching, research, and service, individual faculty citizenship, collegiality, and contribution to other academic endeavors and service responsibilities must also be considered in promotion and tenure evaluations and be judged in part by those served.

Consistent with OSU policy, guidelines apply uniformly to each faculty member. Consistent with the mission of this Land Grant University, the Department recognizes no hierarchy of values among teaching (including extension), research, and public service. There is no distinction made in expected accomplishments for promotion and tenure between nine and eleven month appointments in the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

The foundation for the promotion and tenure process is peer review. The responsibility of the faculty for granting promotion and tenure to other faculty is based on the principle that "scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence, it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments" (from the Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities formulated by the American Council on education, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors).

Scholarship and creative activity are defined as intellectual work, the significance of which is validated by peers and which is communicated. Such work in its diverse forms is based on a high level of professional expertise; must give evidence of originality; must be documented and validated through peer review or critique; and must be communicated in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for the public beyond the University, or for the discipline itself. Each faculty member should have an area or areas of scholarly work for which they are noted. Scholarship is the responsibility of each faculty member in the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science regardless of budgetary appointment (OSU-OARDC-OSUE). Scholarly works should contribute to and be symbiotic with teaching, extension and service roles and should not be viewed as an entity and obligation isolated from these academic functions. For a more detailed discussion of these concepts, faculty should consult the Faculty Reward System Guidelines for Annual Performance Review, Promotion, and Tenure of the College of FAES; a WEB version is available at http://cfaes.osu.edu/products/rewardguidelines.html.
A. CRITERIA

1. Resident Instruction

Resident instruction includes undergraduate and graduate instruction in formal courses, seminars, and individual studies. Directing student research is both a research and teaching activity. Advising students, including academic and career counseling (graduate and undergraduate), is a service activity associated with teaching.

To judge effective resident instruction, faculty will be evaluated on:

- Command of subject including incorporation of recent developments into resident instruction.
- Continuous growth in subject matter knowledge.
- Ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm.
- Objectivity.
- The quality and magnitude of contributions to curriculum development.
- Creativity in course development, methods of presentation, and incorporation of new materials and ideas.
- Capacity to awaken an awareness in students of the relationship between subjects studied and other fields of knowledge.

2. Extension and outreach education

Extension and outreach education refers to planned educational activities by Departmental faculty that are directed primarily toward students/clientele outside the campus classroom. These are persons, other than professional peers, who are not enrolled in courses for academic credit, and include the general public. Outreach education encompasses, but is not limited to, educational activities conducted in conjunction with OSU Extension. Faculty with their primary appointment in Extension are expected to demonstrate contributions through creative analysis, published accounts of applied research and technology, and published review articles. In addition, they are expected to produce materials and programs that digest and reduce to practical application established scientific principles and research of others for plant science clientele.

Expectations of an effective extension and outreach education program include:

- An understanding of the needs for knowledge by outreach students and clientele.
- A contemporary command over subject matter and the ability to glean from the subject matter what is useful for identifying and resolving problems.
- Creativity in subject matter development, methods of presentation, and the incorporation of new ideas.
- The ability to communicate effectively with outreach students, both orally and in writing.
- The development of effective teaching programs and materials.
- The ability to anticipate the "teachable moment" regarding the needs of outreach students and to respond with appropriate educational activities.
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2. Research and other creative works

Each faculty member is expected to develop a research program, the focus and scope of which reflects professional interests as well as Departmental goals as expressed in the individual's position description.

Expectations of a research program take many forms:

- General advancement of knowledge in basic and applied research.
- Development of theoretical and practical innovations for the advancement of knowledge and/or solving of problems.
- Research that culminates in the development of solutions to problems or advanced products.
- Development of empirical techniques.
- The creative application of existing concepts, knowledge, and empirical methods to problem-solving.

4. Service

Service is construed to mean work done or duties performed for others at all levels within the University and professional services to government, business, and professional associations at local, state, national, and international levels. Personal service contributed to civic organizations, church, charities, community, and other organizations does not fall within the definition of professionally-oriented service used herein, except where solicited or contributed in the role of one's faculty and/or professional status.

The Department of Horticulture and Crop Science deems service to programs of the Department, College, University and professional organizations as a responsibility of each faculty member. It is recognized that service will vary among faculty members and for a faculty member over time depending, in part, on the specific faculty appointment. However, a faculty member is expected to provide service in the following major categories: administrative, student, professional, and industry.

5. Faculty citizenship, collegiality and ability to work with others

The missions of the Department, College, and University and positive interactions among faculty and within the general community of scholars in academia cannot be achieved without the demonstration of good faculty citizenship and collegiality. Citizenship and collegiality are not criteria independent of teaching, research, and service, but rather are attitudes and behaviors that are essential to the effective conduct of teaching, research, and service. Collaborative efforts in scholarly work are an important component of collegiality, and without the ability to work effectively with others and exhibit a positive and supportive attitude, other positive attributes and contributions of a faculty member are compromised and the potential for collaborative efforts and advances are forfeited. The negative impact of improper behavior on self-esteem and on collegiality and Departmental image cannot be ignored. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to demonstrate respect and responsible behavior toward peers, staff, and
students. In addition, each faculty member is expected to carry his/her load with respect to academic service and other contributions to the academic life of the department.

6. Promotion to the 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 scholar; 2) has provided effective service; and 3) can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, research, extension, and service relevant to their specific appointment and the missions of the Department, College, and University.

7. Promotion to the 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 outreach education; 2) has produced a significant body of research that is nationally or internationally recognized; and 3) has demonstrated leadership in service. 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.

B. PROCEDURES

1. General considerations and voting procedures

Procedures for promotion and tenure reviews follow the policies set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, the procedural guidelines established by the Office of Academic Affairs, and the specific policies established by the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed by the eligible voting faculty, and by the Chair of the Department. Faculty eligible for voting on P&T decisions shall include tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate, excluding the Department Chair. Departmental voting rules and guidelines on all P&T decisions are as follows:

- The voting-eligible faculty will have a formal meeting to discuss fully a candidate for P&T before the vote on the candidate is taken. The P&T Committee chair will distribute ballots to the faculty at that meeting, and ballots must be filled out and returned to the P&T Chair within five (5) working days after the faculty meeting is held.

- Ballots will be provided to eligible faculty members to render a positive or negative vote on the candidate. These ballots will be placed inside of two envelopes, the outer envelope bearing the name of the eligible faculty member. This is to keep track of which faculty have received ballots. After marking the ballot, the faculty member will insert the ballot in the inner (unmarked) envelope and return it to the Chair of the P&T Committee or his/her designee. The P&T Committee will record that each faculty member has voted and, after all sealed envelopes have been collected, votes will be pooled and counted by two P&T Committee members.
Voting-eligible faculty have the responsibility to objectively review the candidate’s entire dossier including documentation describing accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service as they pertain to the criteria outlined in this document and to participate in the discussion of the case. Every eligible faculty member is expected to vote on P&T decisions. Abstentions are allowed (e.g., if there is a conflict of interest), but must be justified to the Department Chair on a case-by-case basis. Abstentions will not be included as part of the total vote.

Candidates will also be reviewed at the College and University levels. The Department Chair is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the decisions by the Dean or Provost (if negative) or recommendation to the Board of Trustees (if positive).

Appointment to assistant professor within tenure-track faculty ranks is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and is informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member’s record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. Promotion consideration for tenured and adjunct faculty can be initiated in writing either by the faculty member or by the Chair. The criteria and procedures for promotion of adjunct faculty are the same as those for tenured faculty.

2. Regular tenure-track faculty

By the announced due date for dossiers, the faculty member must submit documentation to the Chair supporting the granting of tenure and/or promotion in rank. The document shall be prepared following the Dossier for Promotion and Tenure outline provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and be in support of the Criteria section of this document. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide the supporting information on performance and accomplishments according to this document. The Department Chair and P&T Committee will give advice on the proper preparation of dossiers.

Persons appointed to senior ranks without tenure will be reviewed for tenure no later than the final year of the agreed upon probationary period. If the appointment is renewed after mandatory review, the person involved will be informed by the Chair or Dean, following normal review procedures, whether tenure is to be granted beginning with the next year of service. If tenure is not granted, a one-year terminal year of employment is generally offered according to Faculty Rule 3335-6-09.

For candidates not under mandatory review but wishing a full review for promotion, a majority vote of the P&T Committee members is needed to move forward in the solicitation of outside letters and proceed with the full review by the eligible faculty. In the case of candidates applying for promotion to Professor, the P&T Committee may not deny a formal review more than three consecutive years. Normally, solicitation of letters, full review of the dossier, vote of the eligible faculty, and forwarding of the dossier to the Dean are not done for associate (or assistant) professors with less than five years at that rank. Exceptional individuals with less time in rank can be fully evaluated and voted on by the eligible faculty if a majority of the P&T Committee recommends that earlier promotion is reasonable.

A candidate may withdraw from a review at any time and only the candidate may stop a review for promotion and/or tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage by so informing the Chair of the Department in writing. If the
review process has moved beyond the Department, the Chair shall inform the Dean 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.

The Department Chair is responsible for initiating the promotion/tenure process and providing the Departmental P&T Committee and the rest of the faculty with the target dates for dossier submission, target dates for departmental recommendations, and all other pertinent information provided by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs.

The Department Chair shall also be responsible for obtaining letters from external evaluators and from other units at the University in which the candidate has appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not. The Department Chair will obtain the list of potential evaluators for the candidate compiled by the P&T Committee. The Department Chair shall follow University guidelines in wording the request for letters of evaluation for the candidate. Approximately three months before completed evaluations are needed, the Chair should send out letters asking persons if they would be willing to write an evaluation and setting forth the expectations, anticipated due dates, and the realities of the Public Records Act. Potential evaluators may also be contacted directly as to their willingness to provide a letter of evaluation. Positive responders will then be provided with the most up-to-date draft of the candidate’s dossier and/or curriculum vita and supporting documentation (e.g., journal reprints, teaching evaluations, etc.). Unsolicited letters of evaluation will not be included in the dossier.

Once a final copy of the complete dossier is prepared by a faculty member for promotion/tenure, it is submitted to the Chair. The Chair will make the final dossier, including the letters of evaluation, available to all voting-eligible faculty for review. The Chair or his/her designee will verify the accuracy of citations and other aspects of the dossier, and the dossier will be available for faculty review for a period of two weeks (or at least ten working days) prior to voting by the eligible faculty. At a meeting of the voting-eligible faculty called by the P&T Committee chair and after full discussion, the P&T Committee chair will distribute ballots to the entire eligible faculty. Ballots will also be sent to eligible faculty not present at the meeting. Ballots should be filled out and returned to the P&T Committee chair within five working days after the meeting and in accordance with the voting procedures outlined in section VI.B.1 of this document. Faculty eligible for voting on promotion and tenure decisions shall include tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate excluding the Department Chair. A recommendation by the faculty for promotion/tenure of a candidate must carry a positive vote of two-thirds or more of the voting-eligible faculty.

Following the vote, the Chair will prepare his/her own separate written assessment of the case and recommendation to the Dean for inclusion in the dossier. As soon as the faculty report (see below) and chair’s letter/report have been completed, the candidate will be notified in writing by the Chair of the completion and results of the Department review and of the availability of the faculty and Chair reports. A copy of these reports shall be made available to the candidate upon request. The candidate may provide the Chair with written comments on the Department review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The Chair or the Department P&T Committee may provide written responses to the candidate’s comments for inclusion in the dossier, but only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.

The Department P&T Committee’s responsibility is to serve as the mechanism by which the cases of candidates for promotion and tenure are presented to the voting-eligible faculty for consideration.
Except in cases involving early application for promotion and tenure and applications for promotion to full professor, the P&T Committee shall not serve as voting body, but rather will perform administrative functions associated with faculty review: drafting a thorough assessment of the case, leading the faculty discussion, recording the vote of the faculty, and preparing and amending the draft report on the candidate as needed to reflect faculty discussion. The P&T Committee shall be responsible for gathering internal evidence (beyond that contained in the dossier), if necessary, of the quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service from students and peers within the Department. As a component of the evaluation of an eligible faculty member, the Committee may request the faculty member to appear before the Committee to provide additional information for discussion among the voting-eligible faculty. Likewise, the faculty member may appear before the Committee at his/her request for the purpose of providing additional information for discussion among the voting-eligible faculty. These requests must be granted by the Committee.

Following the faculty meeting to consider the case, a report of the faculty assessment, including both strengths and weaknesses, will be prepared by the Department’s P&T Committee, made available for review by the eligible faculty, discussed and revised by the P&T Committee if necessary, and forwarded to the Department Chair for inclusion in the dossier along with the numerical vote of the faculty.

The P&T Committee is also responsible for providing to the Department Chair a list of potential evaluators which should be comprised primarily of faculty at peer institutions who are in a position to comment objectively and in an informed way both on the quality of the faculty member’s scholarly work and on its significance in the field. In most cases, evaluators should not be former advisers, students, collaborators, or close personal friends. The faculty member under review shall be shown the proposed list of evaluators and be invited to augment this list with a few names of individuals who meet the criteria for objective, credible evaluators. The candidate can also suggest that certain individuals not be asked to write letters due to conflicts of interest or other legitimate causes. These letters (a minimum of 5) will be solicited from peers and will be included as part the promotion/tenure document. It is acceptable to request letters from individuals who collaborate substantially with the candidate, but such individuals should only be asked to comment on the nature of contributions to collaborative work. They should not be asked for an evaluation and such letters should not be counted as external evaluations.

A member of the P&T Committee shall be elected by the committee to serve as the Procedures Oversight Designee (formerly the Affirmative Action Designee). It is the Procedures Oversight Designee’s responsibility to assure that the review body (i.e. the Department and its eligible faculty) follows written procedures governing its review, that the proceedings are carried out in a professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of under-represented groups that could bias their review. The checklist provided at the end of the Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure from the Office of Academic Affairs provides additional information about matters to which the Departmental Procedures Oversight Designee should attend and should be used to assist in carrying out these duties. Although a single P&T Committee member is assigned oversight, all members of the review body must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias for all faculty members. Any procedural difficulties or concerns about a review should first be brought to the attention of the P&T Committee. If they cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the Designee, then they should be brought to the attention of the Department Chair. The Chair must look into the matter and provide a response to the Designee.
regarding either action(s) taken, or explain why no action is thought to be warranted. If the Chair
decides against further action, the Designee may appeal directly to the Dean of the College.

Promotion & Tenure Committee Composition and Terms of Service: The Promotion and Tenure
Committee shall consist of five (5) regular, salaried faculty elected from among tenured professors
and tenured associate professors with the latter comprising no more than two of the members. The
Committee will have at least one member each with his or her primary appointment in resident
instruction, research and extension. The Committee will have members from both the Columbus and
Wooster campuses. The Committee members will serve three-year staggered terms. Election of new
members of the committee will be completed using a timetable that will facilitate the annual schedule
for P&T activities (generally February through November). The Chair of this Committee shall be
elected/selected from within the Committee, will be a full Professor, and will serve a one-year term.
The Department Chair and Associate Chair are ex-officio, non-voting members of this Committee.
However, their attendance at P&T meetings is crucial, providing the Committee with a broad
perspective of each candidate’s performance, resource allocations, and other elements that might be
difficult for the Committee to assess or obtain through documentation available to it.

Election: The Department Chair shall appoint a three-member Nomination Committee from the regular
faculty. These faculty should have the experience and knowledge to represent the Department’s breadth
and scope in respect to programs and location. This Nomination Committee will carry out the
nomination and election process for all elected committee positions with the faculty/staff and maintain
the appropriate staggering of terms. The nomination procedure should result in only two candidates per
position on the final ballot representing as nearly as possible the requirements described above and in
the Composition and Terms of Service section in the Pattern of Administration. The nomination process
will take place during the Fall of each year, and the elections concluded at the annual Departmental
retreat in December to facilitate the annual schedule of Department activities (generally from January to
December).

3. Regular faculty: joint and no-salary appointments

For those regular faculty with a joint appointment outside the Department in a nontenure-initiating unit,
the criteria and procedures for annual reviews, promotions in rank, and granting of tenure will be the
same as regular faculty except that the unit supporting a portion of the faculty member’s salary shall
have input to the evaluation process. This input will be solicited by the Department Chair and in the
case of promotion and/or tenure decisions, will be in writing.

The tenure and/or promotion process for no-salary appointees is initiated within the primary tenure-
initiating or budget unit and the approved rank carries over to the Department for such appointments.
The Department may, if requested, review the performance and contributions of the no-salary
appointment faculty member and submit a written recommendation to the faculty member’s tenure-
initiating unit. A review of the no-salary appointment shall be undertaken within the Department and a
decision shall be rendered by the faculty as to the future of the no-salary appointment.

For regular faculty with a joint appointment with another department that is a tenure-initiating unit,
leadership in proceeding with the promotion and tenure process will be with the department that pays the
greater percentage of salary. If percentage of the salary is equal, it will be agreed at time of hire how
promotion and tenure will be handled. The criteria and procedures for promotions in rank and granting of tenure will be the same as regular faculty, except that the administrator of the unit supporting a portion of the faculty member salary shall have input to the evaluation process. The input in writing for promotion and tenure will be solicited by the Department Chair. It is important that at the time of hire the budget units that contribute to salary define clearly the responsibilities of each unit in promotion and tenure reviews.

4. Auxiliary faculty

a. Visiting faculty
   Visiting faculty appointments are limited to no more than 3 years. The Department of Horticulture and Crop Science will propose a faculty rank consistent with the individual's credentials.

b. Part-time faculty
   The promotion/tenure criteria and process for part-time (auxiliary) faculty will be the same as for regular faculty. The promotion process for these appointments will be initiated by the tenure-initiating unit, if different from the Department (as in the case of a joint or no-salary appointment). For those auxiliary faculty with a no-salary appointment in the Department, the Department will review the performance and contributions of this auxiliary faculty member and submit a written recommendation to the auxiliary faculty member's tenure-initiating unit.

c. Adjunct faculty
   Adjunct faculty will be promoted through a process that is similar to the process for regular faculty. A complete dossier will be reviewed by the P&T Committee, made available to the faculty at large and then be discussed in a meeting of the faculty followed by a vote on whether or not to grant the requested promotion. The exception to general procedures is that the dossier only moves to the next level of review if the administrator at the previous level (Chair or Dean) recommends positively. The recommendation going forth from the Department will be accompanied by a letter from the Department Chair summarizing the candidate's accomplishments and contributions to Department programs and a letter from the P&T Committee chair that reports the discussion and vote of the faculty at large.

C. DOCUMENTATION

1. Peer review of classroom and extension teaching

   I. For Untenured Faculty

      A. Classroom Teaching:

         1. Mentoring Committees appointed by the Department Chair will be responsible for Peer Review.
2. Annual review of teaching will be required for all faculty engaged in teaching, regardless
of their appointment. (Leadership in journal club "courses" is exempted. In preparing
the P&T Application, it is important for candidates to identify journal clubs as such, so
that critical review of these "courses" is not expected.)

3. The Mentoring Committee will review at least one course per year. The untenured faculty
member and the Mentoring Committee Chair will develop a list of courses to be taught in
an academic year. If multiple courses are taught by the faculty member, the course to be
reviewed will be decided based on discussion between the faculty member and his/her
Mentoring Committee. If the Committee and the faculty member desire evaluation of
more than one course, this is acceptable and is actually encouraged in the early years of
the appointment.

4. Components of the annual review may include (but are not limited to) the following:
   a. The Worksheet for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (see Appendix #1 and
      comments below under point #5).
   b. Review of the Syllabus for the course (see Worksheet).
   c. Review of examinations, handouts, and visual aids used in the course (see
      Worksheet).
   d. At least two visits to classroom sessions of the course by different members of
      the Mentoring Committee. In lieu of classroom visits by members of the
      Mentoring Committee, other faculty may be asked to participate in review of the
course and these visits will be organized by the Mentoring Committee Chair.
      Worksheets will be filled out following these visits and supplied to the
      Mentoring Committee Chair.
   e. A review of SEI scores – to be supplied to the Mentoring Committee Chair by
      the instructor as soon as they are available. Mentoring Committees that are
      advising untenured faculty with classroom teaching responsibilities should
      become familiar with the SEI Handbook; copies are available from the AAC
      Chair or from http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/eval_teaching/index.html

5. The Mentoring Committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss teaching
performance based on the above inputs. This discussion should include a critical analysis
of performance and explicit recommendations for improving classroom teaching skills.
Evaluation Worksheets should identify areas where improvement is needed. A written
record of the discussion will be supplied to the faculty member, and a copy will be
retained by the Mentoring Committee Chair for reference in subsequent years; but this
record will not be forwarded to the P&T Committee or Department Chair and will not
become a part of the permanent P&T record.

6. The Mentoring Committee Chair (or designee) will write a letter to the P & T Committee
and the Department Chair summarizing the faculty members' instructional performance
The letter will be signed by the faculty member as an individual, but without indication
that the letter comes from the Mentoring Committee. A copy of the letter will also be
given to the faculty member being reviewed. The letter should comment on all
components of the course presentation as outlined above under #4. An effort should be
made to focus on the positive aspects of the teaching effort, e.g., how the performance of
the faculty member has improved over time. This letter will be written soon after the evaluation is completed but no later than July 1 of each calendar year.

7. Untenured faculty members are encouraged to communicate and share ideas and course materials with faculty at other institutions where similar courses are being taught. Sharing of ideas and teaching materials with other institutions will strengthen the record presented at the 4th and 6th year reviews for Promotion and Tenure and this documentation (e.g., letters) should be included in the P&T application.

8. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair and the P&T Committee to monitor annual activity in mentoring of classroom teaching. The Department Chair will make changes in the composition of the Mentoring Committees where appropriate progress is lacking.

B. Extension Teaching:

1. Mentoring Committees appointed by the Department Chair will be responsible for Peer Review.

2. Annual review of Extension teaching will be required for all faculty who have any Extension appointment, regardless of the size of the Extension commitment.

3. The Mentoring Committee will work with the faculty member to identify opportunities for evaluation. Information supplied by the faculty member should include dates and places where important teaching activities will occur and other OSU faculty who will be in attendance at these activities. (See example in Appendix #2).

4. The Mentoring Committee Chair will work with the faculty member to implement the review process. It is anticipated that other faculty in attendance at an Extension meeting will be able to assist the Mentoring Committee in handing out evaluation forms, etc. The faculty member to be reviewed may provide the evaluation forms to the person responsible for conducting the evaluation at the Extension meeting or workshop. However, the completed forms are to be returned directly to the Chair of the Mentoring Committee. Two or more activities/presentations should be evaluated per year.

5. Mentoring Committee members will attend at least two presentations each year in order to gain a first-hand impression of the quality of teaching skills. In lieu of visits by members of the Mentoring Committee, other faculty may be asked to participate in review of the presentations and these visits will be organized by the Mentoring Committee Chair.

6. Components of reviews of Extension teaching will include (but are not limited to) the following:
   a. Group EEET scores, peer EEET scores, and Expert EEET evaluations. (Copies of the three forms are attached as appendix #3.) (As this policy is implemented, EEET scores obtained in previous years will be included in the record.)
b. Evaluations of performance provided by various Extension teams and organizations such as the Extension Nursery Landscape and Turf team, the Agronomy teams, the Ohio Florist's Association, the Ohio Soybean Association, and the Ohio Wheat Grower's Association are important for development of teaching skills and should be considered in the evaluation of Extension teaching. These evaluations will be supplied to the Mentoring Committee by the faculty member.

c. Appropriate client feedback available from County Agents.

d. A statement of the goals and expectations for the program supplied by the Extension faculty member.

e. Written materials and visual aids, including fact sheets, bulletins, web sites, newsletters, etc. prepared by the Extension faculty member in support of the program.

7. The Mentoring Committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss teaching performance based on the above inputs. This discussion should include a critical analysis of performance and explicit recommendations for improving teaching skills. A written record of this discussion will be supplied to the faculty member and a copy retained by the Mentoring Committee Chair for future reference; but this record of the discussion will not be forwarded to the P&T Committee or the Department Chair and will not be a part of the permanent P&T record.

8. The Mentoring Committee Chair (or designee) will write a letter summarizing the instructor's performance to the P & T Committee and the Department Chair. The letter will be signed by the faculty member as an individual, but without indication that the letter comes from the Mentoring Committee. A copy of the letter will also be given to the faculty member reviewed. The letter should comment on all components of the Extension program as outlined above under #6. An effort should be made to focus on the positive aspects of the Extension Program, e.g., how the Program has improved over time. This letter will be written soon after the evaluation is completed but no later than July 1 of each calendar year.

9. Untenured faculty members are encouraged to communicate and share ideas and program materials with faculty at other institutions where similar Extension programs are offered. Sharing of ideas and teaching materials with other institutions will strengthen the record presented at the 4th and 6th year reviews for Promotion and Tenure and this documentation (e.g., letters) should be included in the P&T application. Expert EEET evaluations from faculty at other institutions will also provide useful documentation of the quality of the program.

10. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair and the P&T Committee to monitor annual activity in mentoring of Extension teaching. The Department Chair will make changes in the composition of the Mentoring Committees where appropriate progress is lacking.

Approved by Office of Academic Affairs:
August 9, 2004
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 EEET 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.
Worksheet for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

## Syllabus Content

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

## Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of instructions/questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match of content to course objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled at reasonable intervals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests appropriate level/s of cognitive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate level of challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Assignments and Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear instructions provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped develop understanding of new principles or concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforced material presented in lectures and/or text etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped develop new skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate level of challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other Teaching Materials & Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Created teaching materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., notes, manuals, lab guides, slide-sets, website, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed 'new' teaching philosophy/approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of teaching skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. attended teaching workshops, seminars, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments on syllabus, tests, assignments, material, and activities:**
# Classroom Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Teacher Organization</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Well-prepared for class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objectives for class clearly stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning activities well-organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class remains focused on objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Raises stimulating and challenging questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitates discussion and group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives clear directions for group work and other forms of active learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps students apply theory to solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides an effective range of challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relates course content to practical applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses a variety of methods to explain or illustrate content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses humor appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Content</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledgeable about subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides sufficient content detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relates course materials to practical applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Directs instruction at an appropriate level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Presentation skills</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Makes subject interesting and holds attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board work is legible and organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course handouts are effectively used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effectively uses visual aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Rapport with students</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Treats students respectfully and fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responds to questions effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates flexibility in responding to student needs, concerns, or interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcomes and respects student perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does not exhibit or permit discriminatory behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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, 2001
   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 Miller, 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, Doug 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