Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
Department of Entomology

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: December 1, 2025

I. Preamble....2
II. Department Mission....2
III. Definitions....3
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty....3
B. Promotion and Tenure Committee (Eligible Faculty Committee)....7
C. Quorum....7
D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty....7
IV. Appointments....8
A. Criteria for Appointment....8
B. Search and Appointment Procedures....13
V. Annual Performance and Merit Review....19
A. Documentation....20
B. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty....21
C. Tenured Faculty....22
D. Professional Practice Faculty....23
E. Research Faculty....24
F. Associated Faculty....24
G. Salary Recommendations....24
VI. Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion....25
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion....25
B. Procedures....32
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals....42
VIII. Seventh Year Reviews....43
IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching....43
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching....43
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching....43

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 (OAA) Policies and Procedures Handbook, and other policies and procedures of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CFAES or "the College") and The Ohio State University (OSU) to which the Department and its faculty are subject. Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow the 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 the appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair ("the Chair"). This document must be approved by the Dean of CFAES (the "Dean") and the Office of Academic Affairs ("OAA") before it may be implemented.

This document 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 for faculty promotion, tenure, and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Dean of CFAES and the OAA 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. 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 recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Decisions concerning 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

Mission Statement: The Department of Entomology develops and implements research, teaching, extension, and outreach programs focused on the role and significance of insects in managed and natural ecosystems, including their negative impacts as pests and positive impacts as providers of ecosystem services.

The Department of Entomology provides instruction in insect biology, ecology, and management at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Through its graduate program, the faculty in the Department train the next generation of scholars in Entomology and in several interdisciplinary programs. Faculty engage in a continuum of applied and basic research in entomology and related areas, consistent with the mission

of a major research-intensive, Land Grant university. Our emphasis in teaching and research is on arthropods. However, we use entomological knowledge to participate in the broader missions of the University. The service activities of Departmental faculty allow interactions with partners in academia, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and industry to promote the advancement of science in society. Departmental faculty members contribute to outreach and engagement activities both inside and outside the University. The extension program of the Department provides information to stakeholders within the university, in Ohio, nationally, and internationally. In all areas of activity, the Department continually seeks to increase the quality of its endeavors. The Department of Entomology, thus, contributes to the University's Land Grant mission of attaining international distinction in research, classroom and extension teaching, and service.

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, all professional practice, and all research faculty in the department.

- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by 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, a professional practice associate professor, or a professional practice professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track, all professional practice, 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 non-probationary 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, all non-probationary professional practice associate professors, and all non-probationary professional practice professors.

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of professional practice associate professors and the reappointment reviews of professional practice professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary 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, all professional practice, 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 non-probationary 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 non-probationary 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 non-probationary research professors.

4 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members follows a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B), a formal search, and candidate interviews. All professional practice, research, and tenure track faculty vote on appointments.

  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 non-probationary professional practice of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

- The reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Administrative Advisory and Planning Committee.

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.

For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and professional practice faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor, and all senior lecturers.

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 Chair, after consulting with the Dean, will appoint a faculty member from another Department within the College.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee (Eligible Faculty Committee)

In the Department of Entomology, the Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The Department Chair will recommend to the faculty a tenure track Professor as chair of the Eligible Faculty committee. The tenure track, professional practice, and research faculty will vote to appoint the committee chair for a three-year term and they may be reelected. Each year, the Eligible Faculty committee also elects one of its members (other than the chair of the committee) as the 'Procedures Oversight Designee' or POD. Multiple PODs may be elected and assigned to individual dossiers being reviewed for promotion or tenure if necessary to facilitate multiple faculty reviews. If a member of the Eligible Faculty committee cannot serve, due to illness or other cause, then the Department Chair shall appoint a replacement.

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 (see POA) may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the 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 Committee of 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 that a faculty candidate is acceptable to the department when a two-thirds majority of 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/her/their 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 a two-thirds majority 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/her/their reappointment, promotion, and/or promotion.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria for Appointment

The Department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department and advance its mission. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research 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 if 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. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is 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 those for an 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. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a 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 Chair, the dean, and OAA. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Evidence of demonstrated ability to carry modern and original research through to completion, as evidenced by publication in refereed journals; to attract extramural funding to support the candidate's research program; to develop communication skills that will lead to effective and high quality teaching; to perform high quality service to the Department and the profession; where appropriate, to conduct effective outreach and extension programs; and a commitment to excellence in the training and mentoring of graduate students.

Probationary periods of appointment of tenure-track faculty will be in accordance of Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary. An Assistant Professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. 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 if requested by the candidate and when the Entomology Eligible Faculty Committee 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 at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment as Associate Professor or Professor requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department's criteria in teaching, research, extension, and service for promotion to these ranks, as appropriate to the candidate's appointment.

Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at that rank 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 (i.e. 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. Professional practice faculty shall be engaged in teaching and outreach related to the mission and goals of the Department. There is no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered regardless of performance.

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 Professional Practice 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 requirement for appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Assistant Professor. Evidence of ability to teach is required.

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 meets, at a minimum, the Department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

3. Research Faculty

Criteria for appointment shall follow the rules applying to research faculty as described in the Rules of the University Faculty, 3335-7-32. Appointment of research faculty

entails one- to five-year appointments. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Research faculty are researchers and shall be engaged in research related to the mission and goals of the Department. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

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 faculty, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

To be considered for an adjunct faculty appointment in the Department of Entomology, a candidate should have credentials commensurate with those of a candidate for a tenure track, professional practice, or research faculty appointment. These should include evidence of a sustained program of research and other relevant professional activity. The candidate is expected to participate in appropriate Departmental activities such as colloquia and seminars. Further, the candidate should qualify for at least Category M Graduate Faculty status. Adjunct faculty will be allowed to advise graduate students in accordance with the policies of the Graduate School.

According to University rules, adjunct appointments must be renewed annually. The Entomology Eligible Faculty Committee will normally review each adjunct faculty member every three years. However, the Department reserves the right to conduct reviews more frequently if necessary. Following each review, the Entomology Eligible Faculty Committee will recommend whether to continue or not continue appointments.

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.

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.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that institution. 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. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

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 the 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, who 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.

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 Faculty

Tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty members from other TIUs within OSU may be given appointments as courtesy faculty in the Department if they are substantially involved in the academic work of the Department. Courtesy faculty are encouraged to participate in other departmental activities and programs. Courtesy appointments are made at the same rank held in their home Department, with promotion in rank recognized. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal, but continuation will require ongoing contributions to departmental activities.

B. Search and Appointment 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. The Department follows search and appointment procedures as detailed in the CFAES APT document and in close consultation with the CFAES Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff Affairs.

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, Professional 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 broad 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 Chapter 5, section 4.1 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 Chair, in consultation with the faculty, determines the need for a tenure-track faculty member based on existing unit strengths and/or gaps. The Chair provides documentation relative to a position by means of the CFAES faculty position request form, to the VP/Dean or designee. The VP/Dean of CFAES must provide approval for the unit before the search process commences. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The Chair works in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff Affairs to appoint 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. The Chair appoints one of the faculty to serve as the Search Committee Chair. Generally, a departmental staff member and a senior graduate student will be appointed to the committee by the Department Chair. At the discretion of the Department Chair, external stakeholders and faculty from other Departments may be appointed to the search committee.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo hiring practices training 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 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 and broad talent pools to ensure alignment with the university's commitment to EEO principles 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, eligible faculty vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank (the results of the vote are provided to the Office of Academic Affairs, along with the other documentation required for offers at senior rank). Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor with tenure require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. If the offer may involve prior service credit, which also requires prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, the eligible faculty vote on the appropriateness of such credit.

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 is advised to 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.

In accordance with procedures established for tenure track faculty positions, professional practice faculty appointments will be created based on departmental priorities and strategic goals as well as meeting the needs of the undergraduate and graduate students. Prospective candidates will submit a dossier formatted as required for a tenure-track position, including curriculum vitae, candidate recommendations, and a teaching statement. Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that potential candidates will provide a teaching seminar (rather than a presentation on scholarship).

3. Research Faculty.

In accordance with procedures established for tenure-track faculty positions, research faculty appointments will be created based on departmental priorities and strategic goals. Prospective candidates will submit a dossier formatted as required for tenure-track positions, including curriculum vitae, letters of recommendation, and a research statement. Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the 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), a formal search, and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search committee and in consultation with the Administrative Advisory and Planning Committee.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the Chair in consultation with the eligible faculty. Compensated associated appointment are generally made for a period of one to three years.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the Department and are decided by the Chair in consultation with the eligible faculty. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments

may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester or annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the Department's curricular needs warrant it, an annual or multiple- year appointment may be offered. Requested appointments for visiting faculty usually come to the Department as a result of an association with an individual member of the faculty and plan to work in their laboratory for a defined period of time while on leave from their own institution. Appointments of visiting faculty are made by approval of the Chair following the written submission of specific plans for scholarly activities to be undertaken during the time the visiting faculty member will be in residence in the Department. Appointment for more than one year requires a majority vote of the faculty.

Adjunct faculty usually come to the Department as a result of: 1) their employment as a scientist within a unit of a governmental research organization (e.g., the United States Department of Agriculture or US Military) or industry partner ; 2) their interest in direct participation or collaboration in the academic programs of the Department; and 3) the Department's willingness to provide them with office and/or laboratory space. Request for an adjunct appointment in the Department for a government scientist will usually follow appointment of the person to a scientific position by the governmental agency and may be initiated by the scientist or by faculty members of the Department. In some cases, requests for adjunct status may come from allied professionals not in residence within the Department (i.e., not using office and/or laboratory facilities under departmental control) who wish to participate in the academic programs of the Department. In all cases of requests for adjunct status, complete, updated curriculum vitae of the candidate will be submitted to the Chair who will transmit copies to all department faculty. The Candidate will submit a letter formally requesting adjunct status which will be discussed at a faculty meeting. Upon a majority vote of the faculty to proceed the candidate will present a departmental seminar in which they will outline the role that they intend to take in the academic programs of the Department. Adjunct status will be granted upon a positive vote of two-thirds of the faculty and approval of the Chair, the Dean, and OAA.

The activities of adjunct faculty resident within the Department will be reviewed annually by the same procedures used for faculty, discussed herein in V. Annual Performance and Merit Review. All adjunct faculty must request renewal annually by August 15th. Renewal requests will initiate a review of the activities of all non-resident adjunct faculty by the Chair. The Chair will review the activity of adjunct faculty in light of service provided to the Department to determine if continuation of adjunct status is warranted. Evaluations will be presented to the Eligible Faculty Committee for their review. If at any time the faculty of the Department judge that any adjunct member of the faculty has not maintained a substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department, renewal of adjunct status can be disapproved by majority vote of the faculty, effective at the end of any annual appointment period. If adjunct status is revoked, further use of departmental space and facilities will be reevaluated and may be denied by the Chair if no longer deemed appropriate.

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 faculty. Request for a 0% FTE courtesy appointment in the Department for a faculty member from another tenure initiating unit within the University may be initiated by that person or by faculty members of the Department. Complete, updated curriculum vitae and a letter of intent from the candidate will be submitted to the Chair who will transmit copies to all Department faculty. The candidate will present a departmental seminar in which they will outline the role that he/she intends to take in the academic programs of the Department. After completion of the seminar, courtesy faculty status, at the same rank as in the TIU, will be granted upon a two-thirds vote of the faculty and approval of the Chair.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews 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 annual merit and performance review of all faculty will take place as early in the spring semester as possible

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to the associate chair. The designee may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, the department 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 department chair or the associate chair must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

In all cases, accountability for the annual review process resides with the TIU head. Upon completion of the individual annual review meetings the department chair and the associate chair will meet to discuss faculty annual performance and merit reviews including any merit compensation decisions.

The annual performance and merit review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching, research, extension, and/or service as set forth in the Department's Policy on Faculty Duties, Responsibilities, and Workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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.

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.

It is important to note that the Department of Entomology has faculty in several physical locations with vastly different job descriptions depending on location and assigned duties. In conducting annual reviews of faculty, the review will pay close attention to the job description developed for each individual faculty member. Differential weight will be given to research, teaching, service, and extension activities as guided by those job descriptions.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department Chair no later than the first day of spring semester classes:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (*required for probationary faculty*)

- Updated documentation of performance and accomplishments entered into Interfolio or other approved electronic platform (*all faculty*)
- Updated CV (*all faculty*)

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. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Department Chair and separately by the Eligible Faculty Committee. The Eligible Faculty Committee chair will notify all members of the committee of the pending review. They will have access to the faculty member's dossier for examination and evaluation prior to the review.

The annual review of probationary faculty will encompass the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, service, outreach and extension as these are appropriate to the candidate's appointment, as well as evidence of continuing development. External evaluations of the faculty member's work are only required for the tenure and promotion reviews, but may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the Eligible Faculty Committee or Department Chair. The Department Chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place.

The result of the Eligible Faculty Committee review is a written assessment and a recommendation regarding reappointment. The assessment should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. The committee chair will provide the Department Chair with the written assessment and a report of the vote regarding reappointment.

At the completion of the Eligible Faculty Committee's review, the Department Chair shall prepare a separate letter to the Dean of the College of FAES that assesses the faculty member's performance and professional development. If the Chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. The Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on plans and goals.

As soon as the Eligible Faculty committee assessment and Chair's letter have been completed, the candidate must be notified in writing of the completion of the review and

provided with copies of the Committee assessment and Department Chair's letter. The candidate may provide the Department Chair with written comments on the review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The Eligible Faculty committee and/or Chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the Departmental level review is permitted.

All annual review letters to date (along with the faculty member's comments, if provided) shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

A recommendation from the chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) and the Dean shall make the final decision in the matter.

1. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty – Fourth Year Review. The fourth-year review of probationary faculty shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion at the Department and College levels except that external letters of evaluation are not required. The Eligible Faculty Committee forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair, who 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 departmental 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. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean. The criteria for promotion and tenure and procedures for the College-level reviews are outlined in the College promotion and tenure document.

2. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty – 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. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (E) does likewise for reducing 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 TIU's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C. Tenured Faculty

All tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are reviewed annually using the same criteria as for untenured faculty.

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who conducts an independent assessment; may meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. Associate professors considering promotion to professor are encouraged to submit a dossier for review by the Eligible Faculty committee a full year before they intend to seek formal evaluation to receive feedback and advice leading up to a formal review. These non-mandatory reviews are not limited and may be requested as desired.

The Chair will forward their annual review recommendations to the faculty member in a formal review letter. The annual review letters become part of a faculty member's permanent file. A faculty member may choose to file a response to the annual review letter that shall also become part of the permanent file.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who may meet with the faculty member to discuss their 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 department, 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; and outstanding service to the department, the college, 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 choose to file a response to the annual review letter that shall also become part of the permanent file.

D. 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 non-probationary 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 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. Research Faculty

The annual review process for probationary and non-probationary research faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, except that non-probationary 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 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. 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 their performance, future plans, and goals. The Chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the Chair, or designee. The Chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their 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 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 as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months.

In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with the Associate Chair. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. The department chair should proactively engage in equity audits of faculty salary to ensure faculty salaries 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 or for the annual department report 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.

Faculty members may discuss their performance with the Chair and/or Associate Chair to ensure that all appropriate activities and accomplishments have been considered. The Chair will review these materials and make salary recommendations. Since the magnitude of pay raises authorized by the University may vary from year to year, the Chair will also consider performance in previous years to address equity issues. These recommendations shall be made in consultation with the Dean of the College of FAES and his/her designees.

VI. Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion

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 ideas and opinions.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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

1**. Promotion to rank of Associate Professor with tenure**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) 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.

As specified by Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty, tenure will not be 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 hindering 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.

All non-tenured faculty members at the Assistant Professor level are reviewed annually for renewal or non-renewal of contract. A mandatory review takes place during the fourth year of service and is based primarily on evidence of development as a productive scholar. Each faculty member is evaluated each year on a combination of criteria that place differential weight on teaching, research, service, and extension activities according to each faculty member's job description. The criteria and examples of evidence for meeting these criteria are:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">TEACHING</th></tr>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</th></tr>
<tr><td>Candidates must have (appropriate to the distribution of effort detailed in the Letter of Offer):</td><td>Candidates will be asked to submit:</td></tr>
<tr><td>• Developed new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course</td><td rowspan="2">• Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, case studies, field trip agenda, problem sets, computer software demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content
• Summary of class comments which demonstrate instructional content up-to-date
• Experts in field or instructional design evaluate and determine syllabi, class evaluation items and class materials up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience (Peer Evaluation of Teaching)
• Faculty external to the department provide expert reviews of course materials (syllabus, assignments, examinations, sample class information) and evaluates meeting contemporary expectations for topic
• Attended continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class
• Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning
• Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning
• Awarding of “Endorsement” from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning</td></tr>
<tr><td>• Demonstrated continuing efforts to deliver innovative teaching
• Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH</th></tr>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</th></tr>
<tr><td>Candidates must have:</td><td>Candidates may be asked to submit:</td></tr>
<tr><td>• Demonstrated thematically focused research/scholarship/creative outcomes that contributes to knowledge in area of expertise and relationship to their scholarly agenda, unit mission, and societal needs</td><td>• A body of work published in peer-reviewed journals that clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research program over time and contributes substantively to knowledge/outcomes in the area of focus.</td></tr>
</table>

• Demonstrated ability to maintain a research program that meets the needs of the department	• The following attributes of the body of work are considered: a. quality, impact, quantity, originality b. unique contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work c. rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues (archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and original works more than edited works); and d. collaborative work, including interdisciplinary and team-based research, is valued, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry. • Complete publication record including archival journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. • Sustained grants and contracts, including foundations, federal agencies, major industry, or private sector – may be as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator with documented focused contribution on multiple grants or projects • White papers that can be shown to have influenced policy or practice • Creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus such as collections, computer code, data sets or databases, genomes or large molecular data sets, specimen cultures or collections, software, and websites • Research awards (internal and external) • Keynote presentations at conferences • Invited talks at symposia, conferences, other field specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the thought leadership of the candidate. • Invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications • The candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. • A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences. • A demonstration of a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, collaborators, and study subjects.

EXTENSION	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit:
• Demonstrated impact through delivery of Extension education to relevant stakeholders • Demonstrated ability to maintain a research program that meets the needs of relevant stakeholders	• A body of work published in peer-reviewed journals that clearly demonstrates integration of an applied research program with stakeholder education in the area of assigned Extension responsibility. • Published Extension Fact Sheets, bulletins, newsletters, podcasts, videos, etc. that translate research for stakeholders and demonstration of impact of adoption of research outcomes • Extension awards (internal and external) • Invitations to present applied research and extension education to appropriate stakeholder groups or organizations • Participation in Extension teams, workshop, field days, and other stakeholder focused events • Review of novel or innovative Extension education materials by subject matter experts (Peer Evaluations of Extension Teaching) • The development and delivery of outreach education programs appropriate to the target audience • Summaries of Evaluations of Effective Extension Teaching (EEET) • The development of teaching or Extension materials
SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit:

Demonstrated excellence in service to the TIU	• Contributions to the Department and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions
	• Contributions may occur as:
	  ○ Committee service (Department, College, University, Scientific Society)
	  ○ Participation in Department, College, University or Scientific Society initiatives
	  ○ Services to students outside the classroom including informal advising, mentoring, or engagement with student organizations
	  ○ Leadership directed at improving the student or staff experience in the Department
	  ○ Activities which elevate OSU Shared Values within the Department or the communities we serve
	• Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to TIU
	• Annual evaluations document excellent service to TIU

Demonstrated high quality administration to the university at any level	• Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions including positive change
Demonstrated community-engagement	• Activities / quality indicators within the Community Setting

	• Unique service to disadvantaged communities
Demonstrate service to the discipline	• Participation in scientific societies including participation in voluntary leadership roles and committee service • Review of publications, editorships, or participation in reviewing for granting agencies • Service on external student committees • Review of other departments or programs external to CFAES

2. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) 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; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

Professors of the Department's Eligible Faculty Committee shall consider recommendations for promotion to Professor at the time of the annual review of the faculty. The criteria for promotion to Professor are based on those set forth for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure (see the description above of the criteria and evidence that support promotion to associate professor with tenure). However, the faculty member will be expected to show considerable scholarly maturity and stature in their field and a research program that spans interrelated fields with a broad, global perspective. The record should demonstrate a substantial body of high quality research and a continued record of extramural research funding. In particular, it is expected that outstanding scholarship, the development of an international scientific reputation, and significant professional service in positions of responsibility be demonstrated for promotion to Professor.

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 their 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 and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this Department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure as detailed above. Research activity is not expected. 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 and professional practice; leadership in service to the Department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. 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 research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Specific criteria in research for promotion to Research Associate Professor are similar to those for promotion to Tenure Track Associate Professor as detailed above. 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 funding is required along with evidence of a national research 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 funding is required along with evidence of an established international research reputation. 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, 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 and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 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 document 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 Eligible Faculty Committee 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 them.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary 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.

Meritorious teaching activities may be documented by as many of the following as possible or relevant:

- Faculty evaluation of classroom performance. Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness is the primary component of teaching evaluation. Peer evaluations of teaching should take place as detailed in Section IX.B. of this document.
- Student opinions and judgments, appropriately documented and accompanied by interpretive information are essential. Student Evaluations of Instruction must be solicited for every course offering. Faculty may supplement the SEI with other evaluation forms of their own design including written statements by students.
- Documentation of development of new and effective techniques for instruction and instructional materials, including, as appropriate, syllabi, examinations, laboratory instruction manuals, textbooks, and tutorial materials. Successful modifications of existing courses should also be documented
- Recognition or awards for distinguished teaching
- Evidence of excellence in mentoring of undergraduate and honors students and graduate students under their supervision. Evidence may include student awards and honors, placement of mentees into graduate school or professional positions, student publications or theses, student presentations, and other demonstrations of student success.

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.

Evidence to document meritorious research includes:

- Publications. The kind, scope, and substantive contributions of the individual being reviewed are considered. Peer-reviewed publications based on original research have primary importance as evidence of scholarly achievement. Textbooks, book chapters, laboratory manuals, and computer software intended as tools for instruction are judged as scholarly works to the extent that they present new ideas or incorporate the results of scholarly research. Book chapters and review papers based on scholarly synthesis are also considered.
- Published data sets, annotations or assemblies of genomic data, maintenance of biological collections, major contributions to publicly available databases, and production of similar scientific resources are considered evidence of excellence.
- Presentations and participation in sections, panels and symposia at professional meetings are considered evidence of scholarly achievement in research. Recognition is given to invitations to present scholarly lectures to academic, governmental or corporate institutions.
- Special importance is attached to successful competition for peer-reviewed external funds to support the faculty member's research program.
- Invitations to provide scientific consultation and expertise such as to scientific societies, state and federal policy makers, and national academies. These may include, but are not limited to, expert testimony, presentations, white papers, and invited opinion articles.
- Obtaining patents based on original research.
- Research awards or honors conferred.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary 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.

Evidence to document meritorious service includes:

- Service to the Department, which may include work on committees or other tasks to which the faculty member has been assigned; coordination of programs and courses; development of new courses or curricula which is not already covered under teaching activities; advising students; and any other matters related to the academic goals of the Department.
- Service to the College and the University, which may include work on committees, other or creative service activity that results in tangible benefits to students, faculty, programs, the Department, or to the University in general.
- Service to the profession such as review and editorial duties, committee service and leadership positions in scientific societies.
- Awards and special recognition honoring service.

In the evaluation of assigned extension duties, the following may be used as evidence of effectiveness in extension activities:

- Peer and audience evaluations of public presentations.
- Peer and public evaluations of published extension materials.
- Development of creative programs and approaches to problems as outlined in Plans of Work.
- Successful completion of innovative programs that result in tangible benefits to stakeholders.
- Effective teaching in extension activities may be evaluated using the Evaluation of Effective Extension Teaching (EEET) form.

The candidate seeking a non-mandatory review in the upcoming cycle (see below) should inform the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair and the Department Chair of intention to be reviewed by March 15. Candidates in a mandatory review year will be informed by the Eligible Faculty Committee Chair in the spring of the year preceding review. The Committee Chair will inform the candidates of the deadline for submission of the following material to the Eligible Faculty committee for department review:

- the completed core dossier
- a complete set of Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEIs) for the period to be reviewed
- a complete set of Peer Evaluations of Teaching for the period to be reviewed (see section IX.B. of this document for details)
- Evaluation of Effective Extension Teaching (EEETs) if applicable
- annual review letters for the period to be reviewed
- all review letters from the Eligible Faculty Committee for the period to be reviewed

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of teaching (e.g., SEIs, Peer Evaluations, EEETs) is forwarded along with the dossier. The documentation of scholarship and service is for use during the departmental review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

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

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or 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.

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, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

b Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Eligible Faculty Committee 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 be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04A(3) 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:** Elect from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the Eligible Faculty committee. The POD'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). 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 provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their 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 or is a member of a Discovery Theme.

- 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.

- 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.

c 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. For tenure-track assistant professors, department chairs are to 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 Eligible Faculty 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. This evaluation should be shared at the department level of the review and incorporated with the review by the department chair.

- 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 committee 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 committee 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 Committee 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 Committee and department chair;
    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Eligible Faculty Committee and department chair; and
    - 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 they will 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 Eligible Faculty Committee'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 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 for whom promotion is a possibility 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 (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases).

3 External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs: Auburn University, Cornell University, Iowa State University; Kansas State University; Michigan State University, North Carolina State University; Oklahoma State University; Penn State University, Purdue University; Rutgers University; Texas A&M University; University of Arizona; University of Arkansas; University of California; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Guelph; University of Illinois; University of Kentucky; University of Nebraska; University of Minnesota; University of Wisconsin-Madison; Virginia Tech; Washington State University. 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 faculty promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research faculty 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 the Eligible Faculty Committee.

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 primarily 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 June 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 the Promotion and Tenure Committee, 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 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, during 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

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 (B) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

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 TIU. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if students will be asked 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. The chair or a delegate of the chair will appoint reviewers from the faculty as needed to review instruction. 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 the department are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track, professional practice, and associated faculty at least once per course, per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary professional practice associate professors at least once every other year, with the goals of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a four-year period and of having four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.

- to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professional practice professors at least once every other year or, when a course is offered every other year, every other course offering, with the goal of assessing teaching

at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.

- 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 and typically follow a significant course redesign or content revision. 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 or review of online asynchronous lectures, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. 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 desired. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.