AGRICULTURAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, TENURE: CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 10/31/2025

Contents

I. PREAMBLE....4
II. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION....4
A. Vision....4
B. Mission....4
III. DEFINITIONS....5
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty....5
1. Tenure-track Faculty....5
2. Professional Practice Faculty....5
3. Research Faculty....6
4. Associated Faculty....6
5. Conflict of Interest....7
6. Minimum composition....7
B. Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee (Promotion and Tenure Committee)....7
C. Quorum....8
D. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty....8
1. Appointment....8
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion....8
IV. Appointments....8
A. Criteria....8
1. Tenure-track Faculty....9
2. Professional Practice Faculty....10
3. Research Faculty....10
4. Associated Faculty....11
5. Emeritus Faculty....12
6. Joint Appointments....12
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty....12
B. Procedures....13
1. Tenure-track Faculty....13
2. Professional Practice Faculty....15
3. Research Faculty....15
4. Transfer from the Tenure Track....15
5. TIU Transfer....15
6. Associated Faculty....15
7. Joint Appointments....16

8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 16
V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS 16
A. Documentation 17
B. Procedures: Probationary Tenure-track Faculty 18
1. Fourth-Year Review 18
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock 19
C. Procedures: Tenured Faculty 19
D. Procedures: Professional Practice Faculty 19
E. Procedures: Research Faculty 20
F. Procedures: Associated Faculty 20
G. Salary Recommendations 20
VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION 21
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion 21
1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure 21
2. Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Professor 28
3. Professional Practice Faculty 29
4. Research Faculty 29
5. Associated Faculty 30
B. Procedures 30
1. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty 30
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty 35
3. External Evaluations 35
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS 37
VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS 37
IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING 38
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching 38
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching 38
Appendix I: FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF ENDOWED AND NAMED PROFESSORS 40
A. Timing 40
B. Self-report 40
C. External evaluations 40
D. Department Review 40
Appendix II: AEDE Extension Evaluation Tool (AEET) 41

I. PREAMBLE

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

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

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal employment opportunity.

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION

A. Vision

We use economics to promote a prosperous and sustainable society for all people through engaged world-class research, teaching, and outreach in areas of food, agriculture, environment, and the development of human well-being.

B. Mission

We create meaningful impact on the development of society through applied economics, with focus on food, agricultural, and environmental and natural resource systems. We advance sustainability and prosperity for all people through engaged excellence. Our hallmarks are:

- Innovative, creative, and rigorous research
- Analyses at local, regional, and international scales
- Welcoming and enriching educational experiences
- Engagement with a wide range of audiences that honors and values differences
- Forward-looking leadership in service
- Work that is transparent, unbiased, and fact-based
- Constructive and respectful discourse

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the department. The department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2. Professional Practice Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a professional practice assistant professor, professional practice associate professor, or a professional practice professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the department.
- Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.
- Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, all professional practice faculty, and all research faculty in the department.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary professional practice of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.
- For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all nonprobationary professional practice faculty and tenure-track faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1 above.
- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary professional practice faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

5. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when he/she/they are or have been to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

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

6. Minimum composition

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

B. Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee (Promotion and Tenure Committee)

The department's Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee (PEAC) assists the eligible faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of four tenured faculty members. Members have rotating four-year terms, based on the Calendar year (January 1-December 31) so that one member is replaced each year. The senior member serves as committee chair. Committee members are elected by the eligible faculty.

When considering a case involving a professional practice faculty member the PEAC may be augmented by 1 professional practice faculty member at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

When considering a case involving a research faculty member the PEAC may be augmented by 1 research faculty member at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

C. Quorum

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

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

D. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

1. Appointment

   A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his or her appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

   A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his or her reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, or contract renewal.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

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

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

All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

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

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the PEAC determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure or Professor with tenure and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the

probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

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

2. Professional Practice Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other professional practice faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to professional practice faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

The department supports Professional Practice Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who are engaged primarily in teaching activities related largely to courses or instructional situations involving professional skills. Professional Practice faculty members are also expected to provide service to the department, the college, the university, the profession, and supporting industries. Professional Practice Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

Professional Practice Instructor. Appointment is normally made at the rank of professional practice instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate is the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of professional practice assistant professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

Professional Practice Associate Professor and Professional Practice Professor. Appointment at the rank of professional practice associate professor or professional practice professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

3. Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year appointments. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. External appointees at the research associate professor or research professor level will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research and service as persons promoted within the department.

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

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

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

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

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

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

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty

members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

5. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-36. Full-time tenure track, professional practice, research, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

6. Joint Appointments

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

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty member from another unit at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

In addition, see the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

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

- "Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment" is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit EEO goals and advance the eminence of the institution.
- "Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants" focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- "Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations" provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- "Phase 4 | Extend Offer" provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- "Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard" offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- "Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search" is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

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

2. Professional Practice Faculty

Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on professional practice rather than scholarship.

3. Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the virtual or on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class.

4. Transfer from the Tenure Track

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

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

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

5. TIU Transfer

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

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

6. Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Joint Appointments

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS

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

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

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

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

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

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, Extension, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- Updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- Department supplement, which includes statements of key accomplishments and goals for the next year.

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

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

B. Procedures: Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate’s scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written or electronic ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

If either the department chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member’s probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college’s Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

C. Procedures: Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair who conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

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

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

D. Procedures: Professional Practice Faculty

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

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

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

E. Procedures: Research Faculty

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

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

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

F. Procedures: Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

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

G. Salary Recommendations

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review (which has input from the PEAC and the Administrative Team) as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in the department. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

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

VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION

The department is bound by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (D) to ensure reasonable flexibility when evaluating qualifications in teaching, scholarship, Extension, and service.

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, Extension, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing where the case requires, heavier commitments or administratively assigned responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. Because faculty will ordinarily have major assigned commitments and responsibilities in teaching, research, and/or Extension, more weight will be attached to the dominant area(s) when evaluating performance. Accomplishments will not be expected in a mission area if the faculty member had no percentage appointment in that area.

As faculty enter and/or place new emphasis on new fields of work, including interdisciplinary endeavor, instances will arise in which work of the faculty member may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases, care must be taken to apply criteria with appropriate flexibility. In all cases, intellectual excellence is essential for promotion to tenured positions.

Note that reviews of endowed and named professors for recommendations regarding reappointment are separate from reviews for promotion and tenure; see Appendix I.

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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

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

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

1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-

quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

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

Work at previous institutions and/or prior to the date of appointment to the tenure track will be considered as part of the candidate's body of work. Emphasis will be placed on productivity since the appointment at Ohio State to the extent that it demonstrates continuing productivity. Tenure and promotion are based on the candidate's body of work and demonstration of promise for sustained productivity.

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, research, Extension, and service are generally expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered. **Note that most faculty will not have work relevant to all of the criteria listed, and it will be rare to have all listed types of evidence present for a case.**

a. Teaching

Teaching includes traditional classroom or online for-credit course teaching, field teaching such as study abroad, graduate dissertation advising, undergraduate research advising, student mentoring, curriculum development, and outreach teaching e.g. to the public or K-12 students. Not all faculty will have engaged in all possible teaching-related activities.

To judge excellence in teaching, faculty will be evaluated on the following criteria **as appropriate for their teaching assignment, appointment, and rank**. Evaluation will be based on student feedback scores and comments, peer evaluation, documentation of teaching activity, and documentation of participation in professional development of teaching skills. Evidence may also include awards and documentation of scholarship of teaching and learning.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Developed effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course Demonstrated command of subject and continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	• Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, problem sets, projects, etc. demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content • Experts in field evaluate and determine if syllabi, assessment, and class materials are up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience • Adopt new materials in class as appropriate • Professional presentations or peer-reviewed publications on course design, pedagogy • Course materials adopted by others in the profession
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	• Student evaluation scores, comments • Peer evaluation of these areas
Demonstrated skill and creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom or online technology, games and activities, and other teaching strategies to create an effective and engaging learning environment	• Use of multimodal techniques or approaches to stimulate class participation and learning • Peer evaluation descriptions of mode of instruction • Professional presentations or peer-reviewed publications on course delivery • Course materials adopted by others in the profession
Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and critical thinking	• Student evaluation scores • Peer evaluations
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	• Qualitative student comments
Treated students in courses with respect and courtesy and ensured learning environments were accessible and welcoming to all students.	• Qualitative student comments
Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs	• Involvement and specific outcomes in curriculum development • Leadership in development of the curriculum and courses which goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations
Advised and mentored an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's rank and area(s) of expertise; graduate advising meets standards of best practices	• Graduate teaching listed in the core dossier such as involvement in graduate exams and dissertations • Department records of student feedback on graduate advising
Mentored and taught undergraduates outside classrooms	• Undergraduate advising and mentoring activities listed in the core dossier such as individual mentoring, supporting student clubs, advising undergraduate research, letters of recommendation, leading study abroad
Engaged in effective outreach communication with non-traditional-student learners, not focused on Extension	• Outreach communication listed in the core dossier • Evidence of impact of communication such as views of online materials or participants in events.

Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching. Any candidate whose annual reviews have suggested teaching deficiencies should provide documentation of efforts to improve teaching.	Examples include: • Completed consultation and training at Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning. • Teaching portfolio demonstrating teaching outcomes after efforts to improve • Annual evaluations – setting goals, document activities in which faculty member participated, changes made to teaching, and outcomes of the change (improvement in student success, SEI improvements, etc.) • Awarding of "Endorsement" by the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning

b. Scholarship

Each faculty member is expected to develop a research program, the focus and scope of which reflects important economic problems, professional interests, and department mission (as expressed in the individual's position description and other documents). High-quality multi-disciplinary scholarship is valued equally to high-quality disciplinary scholarship. All faculty members are expected to pursue extramural funding appropriate to their research programs, commensurate with the need for funding to support their research and the opportunities for funding available. The primary goals of extramural funding are to support production of high-quality research outputs, support departmental graduate students, and help fund departmental support resources.

- **Productivity**:
  - A portfolio of research is evaluated with the understanding that there is often a tradeoff between the number of publications (typically 1-2 each year) and the quality of the scholarship. The quality of the total portfolio is more important than the count of papers.
  - Publication in applied economics is slow. The average lag time in economics between initial journal submission to publication is over two years, top general-interest journals have single digit acceptance rates, and top field journals often have acceptance rates well below 15%. Multidisciplinary research may be reviewed more quickly, but team formation can add delay.
  - For promotion evaluations, a peer-reviewed publication is considered 'published' upon formal acceptance by the editor. 'Forthcoming,' 'Available online,' and 'In-Print' statuses are viewed identically for evaluative purposes. Due to slow publication rates, papers in "revise-and-resubmit" and "conditionally accepted" statuses are given non-zero weight in evaluating research for tenure.
  - For annual reviews, papers are counted as 'published' in the year they are first available online.
- **Types of journals**:
  - There is no single journal or small set of journals in which faculty must publish.
  - Appropriate outlets vary by field of scholarship.
  - Impact factors vary widely between type of journal (science vs. economics) and among fields in economics. A journal's impact factor is a weak measure of the quality and import of the work.
- **Publications other than peer reviewed journal articles:**
  - Products such as books, book chapters, edited volumes, monographs, and textbooks contribute to scholarship if they require significant investigation, conceptual or empirical innovation, and/or creative synthesis on the part of the author.
  - Publications have more weight in evaluation if subject to review by another expert in the field.
  - Unpublished papers and publications that are not peer-reviewed contribute to valued scholarship if the author demonstrates their quality and usefulness, e.g. in an Extension setting.
- **Team research:**
  - Multi-authored research is common and valued.
  - Much research completed by a faculty member in this department is done in collaboration with

graduate and undergraduate students and post-doctoral fellows. Publications with students and postdocs are not required, but reflect well on a faculty member's research program when present.
  - Authorship order conventions vary widely in applied economics (some use alphabetical order; some prioritize first authorship; some list senior authors last). Thus, such conventions should not play a dominant role in evaluation.
- **Grant funding**: Grant funding is important, but some faculty in applied economics earn tenure without competitive grants. Faculty are generally expected to engage in grant **application** activity for promotion to Associate with tenure, and to have some external grant success for promotion to Full.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Published a body of high-quality work in high- quality peer-reviewed journals; this work should contribute substantively to knowledge in the area of focus	• Journal ranking, citation index, impact on field • Publications in the discipline's flagship journals (highly valued) • Sufficient productivity over time according to norms in the field • Prizes and awards for research or scholarly work • External reviewer comments • The candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment
May have produced other valued scholarship such as presentations, books, book chapters, edited volumes, monographs, and bulletins based on original research	• Listed publications other than journal articles • Presentations in scholarly venues of the candidate's field
Demonstrated influence on the work of others	• Indicators of activity to the profession/discipline that indicate impact and importance in the candidate's field • External reviewer comments • Citations
Demonstrated promising research productivity in the future	• Establishing a pipeline of working papers ranging from revise and resubmitted papers to working papers in preparation for submission
Applied for and received external grants (expectations are specific to the field and funding environment)	• Wrote and submitted proposals for grant funding. • Secured competitive peer-reviewed research funding – national or international grants from funding agencies including government agencies and private foundations • Secured contracts from industry groups, nonprofits, or governments to support independent research
Developed emerging national/international reputation in the candidate's field (For promotion to full Professor: reputation is established)	• Recognition by external reviewers that the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession and the extent to which that person has been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioners • Presentations in competitive or invited forums • Invitations to review research papers, grant proposals • A beginning positive trend of citations
Had scholarly impact through engagement with business, government, other users of research	• Research leveraged in a commercial setting • Consulting work with industry and other external partners • Participation in activities like advisory committees for government, NGOs, other users of research

Demonstrated a high degree of professional ethics	• High degree of ethical conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to research and ethical treatment of students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators • Contributes to a positive and compelling working environment for all faculty, staff and students

c. Extension

Extension refers to research and educational activities directed primarily toward students/clients/users outside the campus classroom. These are persons who are not professional peers and who are not enrolled in courses for academic credit. Extension programs will vary in their mixture of research and education, but all programs should involve some engagement with people. Evaluation is of the development and delivery of an outreach educational program with has a clear set of goals determined through needs assessments and/or active participation with the target audience which may be other people in the Extension network. The general public may also be an audience for some programs.

- Extension research is original or translational research which creates and/or synthesizes knowledge that is useful for the audience at hand.
- Extension education creates materials to communicate that knowledge and carries out effective dissemination. Methods used in Extension education are highly varied, and may include individual consultations, curricula, short courses, face- to-face meetings, public seminars or speeches, written communication, Internet blog postings, publications, web-based seminars (webinars), podcasts, creation of decision tools, and other novel and emerging communication methods.
- The relative importance of the criteria below depend on the nature of the outreach program and will vary over the life of the program, and establishing a program can take a significant amount of time. For example, in the first years of an outreach education program, audience and problem identification and development of educational materials would be more important than the number of people reached through communication.
- Materials used to evaluate Extension include dossier documentation of research products and educational activities, peer evaluations, participant evaluations and comments, awards.

Extension	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Has identified an audience/clientele for the Extension program and understands their needs	• Evidence of engagement with target audience and/or related Extension personnel • Clear narrative explaining education needs the program is designed to meet
Has contemporary command of the subject matter and/or has created new knowledge and understanding on the subject. and has gleaned from the subject matter what is useful to the Extension audience.	• Extension publications and products such as fact sheets, journal articles, white papers, issue briefs, popular articles, digital tools, etc. • Evidence of value of products where available such as views, downloads, references, evaluations, testimonials
Has developed effective teaching materials and educational activities to meet the needs of Extension audiences	• Teaching materials and activities developed that are used by the faculty member or adopted by others in Extension. • Educational publications have been designed to reach target audiences directly.
Has communicated effectively with Extension audiences, both orally and in writing.	• Documentation of education and communication activities (in-person or online, synchronous or asynchronous, oral and written) • Evidence of quality and impact including number of participants, number of views, evaluations such as EEET or similar AEDE Extension Evaluation Tool (AEET) – see Appendix II.
Has contributed to team and/or interdisciplinary efforts	• Helped organize Extension meetings/conferences • Was involved in program planning and development, proposals for program funding • Other team/interdisciplinary activities • Has risen to a leadership position (not necessary)

d. Service

The Department of Agricultural, Environmental, and Development defines service as work done or duties performed for others.

Formal service: This includes: administrative and collegial services at all levels within the university; professional service to the academic profession; professional service to government, industry, non-government organizations, other universities. No faculty member will engage in all the types of service listed below. Capacity for service grows with a faculty member's knowledge and experience; thus, **service expectations increase with rank both in quantity and in degree of leadership.**

Informal Service: A faculty member contributes informally to department productivity by influencing the productivity of other faculty. Responsibilities to one's peers include, but are not limited to: reviewing other people's teaching and research materials; regional and national project writing committees; and peer evaluation of instruction. A faculty member contributes to productivity of other faculty by positive interactions apparent in cooperative research efforts, team teaching, and the like. Positive and supportive attitudes and contributions to productivity of other faculty are apparent from co-authorship of articles, collaboration in submitting research grants, teaching improvement proposals, sharing of innovative ideas in committee meetings. The department values contributions of each faculty member to collegiality: responsible and respectful behavior toward peers, staff, and students.

SERVICE	
Expectations	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Contributed to the governance of the Department, College, and University, and demonstrated the promise of future contributions	• Service in Department, College, or University committees, governance processes • Participation in faculty meetings and in department seminars and workshops • Service as a Department Program Director or Chair of major College or campus committee. • Annual evaluations documenting good formal service to the department
Made useful contributions to the profession and demonstrated the potential for significant contributions	• Involvement with professional journals (journal editorships, reviewer) and professional societies (offices or committees) • Professional conference organization • Served on grant review panels • Awards and prizes for service to profession
Engaged in useful service for external audiences	• Served as consultant or advisory board member to industry, NGO, government • Served as a member of panels and commissions • Carried out faculty and/or program reviews for other universities
Informal service	• Annual evaluations documenting good informal service to the department • Evidence of cooperative engagement with others in the department • Awards for informal mentoring

2. Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

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

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

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same

distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the Department, college, and university.

3. Professional Practice Faculty

Promotion to Professional Practice Assistant Professor. For promotion to professional practice assistant professor, a faculty member must complete his/her doctoral degree and be performing satisfactorily in teaching and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor. For promotion to professional practice associate professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher including some scholarship of teaching and learning and/or developing recognition of teaching at the university and/or national level. The faculty member must also show convincing evidence of providing effective service, and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor. For promotion to professional practice professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including: a sustained record of excellence in teaching; leadership in service to the department, university, and/or national professional organizations such as NACTA or the teaching sections of the AAEA; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials related to teaching such as presentations, publications, and curricula materials pertinent to pedagogy. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

5. Associated Faculty

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

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

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.4.

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

B. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules 3335-6-04 for tenure-track faculty, 3335-7-05 for professional practice faculty, 3335-7-32 for research faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*.

1. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty

a. Candidate Responsibilities

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

- **Dossier:**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

While the Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee (PEAC) makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

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

prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Teaching documentation in the dossier includes: cumulative SEI reports, peer evaluations of teaching; the list of teaching activities in the core dossier.

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

Extension documentation in the dossier includes: EEET or AEET evaluations, peer evaluations of Extension; the list of Extension activities in the core dossier.

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

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

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of teaching is forwarded along with the dossier. The documentation of scholarship, Extension, and service is for use during the departmental review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

It is the department's responsibility to evaluate and verify the documentation submitted.

- **Supplements to the Dossier**
  - The candidate shall submit a complete CV which is supplemented by brief (max of 750 words each) narratives summarizing their work in teaching, scholarship, Extension, and service as relevant to their appointment. This shall be forwarded to external reviewers.
  - Key materials relevant to the Department review that are **not** available online through a permanent DOI or stable web link listed in the Dossier and full CV should be submitted (e.g. deposited in in the "Scholarship" tab of Interfolio) for review by the eligible faculty. These include:

- Copies of materials (papers, books, other significant materials) that represent important contributions of the candidate to innovations and/or scholarship in teaching and learning (no more than 3)
- Copies of Extension materials (publications, presentations, demonstrations, etc.) that represent important elements of the candidate's Extension program (no more than 3)
- Copies of books and other materials that represent important elements of the candidate's Scholarship. (no more than 3)

- **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document**

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

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

- **External Evaluations** (see also External Evaluations below)

As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to departmental guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the department chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the department, the chair shall inform the Dean of the candidate's withdrawal.

b. *Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee Responsibilities:*

The Department Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee (PEAC) (as defined in the department's Pattern of Administration document) will present the case for promotion and tenure to eligible faculty for their consideration. The responsibilities of PEAC are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may

consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for non-probationary professional practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described here.
  - **Late Spring**: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
  - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
  - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
  - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
  - Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
  - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
  - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

c. Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the Eligible Faculty Committee are as follows:

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the departmental review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and the department chair
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the PEAC's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

3. External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs that are peers and aspirational peers: Purdue University, Michigan State University, Iowa State University, Oregon State University, University of Georgia, Pennsylvania State University, Texas A&M University, Kansas State University, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Colorado State University, University of Minnesota, University of Florida, North Carolina State University, University of Wisconsin, UC Berkeley, UC Davis, Cornell University, University of Maryland College Park

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained

for professional practice or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a professional practice or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of PEAC.

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

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by PEAC, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty and research

faculty can be found here. A sample letter for professional practice faculty can be found here.

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

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

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

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

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

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

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

VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

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

A faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by the department, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year.

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the department chair appoints individuals to carry out Peer Review of Teaching. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of peer reviewers of teaching are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and professional practice faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the probationary period.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary professional practice assistant and associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary professional practice professors as needed to learn more about concerns raised by SEIs or as needed in support of award nominations.
- to review the teaching of full-time lecturers at least once every year, with the goal of reviewing classroom instruction for a few courses and the content and design of all courses taught during each three-year cycle.
- to review the teaching of full-time senior lecturers at least once every other year, with the goal of reviewing the content and design of all courses taught during each three-year cycle.
- to review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the

review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Appendix I: FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF ENDOWED AND NAMED PROFESSORS

Appointments to endowed chairs and named professorships are for terms not to exceed 5 years, with reappointment subject to review. Typically, these individuals will be tenured faculty members, and this process does not affect their tenure or academic rank. This appendix specifies procedures to be followed in department review of endowed chair holders and named professors.

A. Timing

The review should be conducted in the semester prior to the reappointment decision.

B. Self-report

In addition to an updated CV, the candidate for reappointment (to an endowed chair or named professorship) will prepare and submit a self-report indicating key accomplishments since the previous (re) appointment, the impacts(s) of the endowed program under the candidate's direction, challenges for future programming, and plans for the future. The self-report should have two parts:

1. A brief report on the endowed program, including:
    a. The structure of the endowed program, including organization and role of advisory council (if any).
    b. A summary of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, research, outreach teaching, and service, since the previous (re)appointment.
    c. A description of program-supported activities
    d. Impacts of the program on the department, university community, stakeholders, and the general public.
2. Plans and investments in future programs

C. External evaluations

The Department Chair or PEAC may solicit letters of evaluation from the program Advisory Committee, stakeholders or recognized authorities in the candidate's area of specialization if deemed necessary or appropriate. The candidate for reappointment may submit external letters of support if he/she so chooses.

D. Department Review

1. The PEAC will review the self-report and the candidate's CV. Copies of the document chartering the endowment (as amended) will be made available to the PEAC upon request.
2. The PEAC will conduct a meeting of all voting AEDE faculty to provide input into the review. Copies of the document chartering the endowment (as amended), the self-report, and any external review letters will be made available to faculty prior to this meeting. The PEAC may choose to meet with the candidate for an interview if the PEAC deems it appropriate or necessary.
3. The PEAC will provide a brief written and oral report of findings and recommendations to the department chair.
4. The department chair will draft a written recommendation to the Vice President for Agricultural Administration and Dean of the College, concerning reappointment.
5. The PEAC and department chair's written recommendations will be made available to the candidate. The candidate will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the PEAC and Department Chair's recommendation.
6. The Department Chair's recommendation and the response (if any) will be forwarded to the VP and Dean.

Appendix II: AEDE Extension Evaluation Tool (AEET)

Thank you for attending this event. Would you please help us by answering a few questions about the presentation? We expect this will take just a few minutes of your time. Thanks!

1) Please state the strength of your agreement with the following question about the presentation in general by moving the slider to the right or left:

The presentation provided me with new information I can use over the next year.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2) Please rate your level of agreement with each statement below by moving the slider.
(SAME 5 point scale for each)

The presenter….

- Was well prepared
- Was interested in helping me learn
- Showed respect for all persons attending the workshop
- Stimulated me in wanting to learn
- Answered questions clearly
- Related program to real-life situations
- Gave clear expectations
- Held my attention
- Presented information that will help me
- Was an outstanding instructor overall

3) Please add any additional comments about the presentation.