

**Appointments, Promotion, and
Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
Department of Food Science and
Technology**

Approved by the Faculty: 10/23/2020

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 11/25/2020

Revision approved by FST Faculty: 12/16/2025

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 12/16/2025

Table of Contents

I Preamble4

II Department Vision and Mission4

III Definitions4

 A Committee of the Eligible Faculty4

 1 Tenure-track Faculty5

 2 Clinical Faculty5

 3 Research Faculty6

 4 Conflict of Interest in the Committee of the Eligible Faculty6

 5 Minimum Composition6

 B Quorum.....6

 C Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....7

 1 Appointment.....7

 2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal7

IV Appointments7

 A Criteria.....7

 1 Tenure-track Faculty7

 2 Clinical Faculty8

 3 Research Faculty8

 4 Associated Faculty8

 5 Emeritus Faculty.....9

 6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty10

 B Procedures10

 1 Conflict of Interest in a Search and on a Search Committee.....10

 2 Search for Tenure-track Faculty.....11

 3 Search for Clinical Faculty.....13

 4 Search for Research Faculty.....13

 5 Transfer from the Tenure-track13

 6 Associated Faculty13

 7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty14

V Annual Performance and Merit Review14

 A Documentation15

 B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty15

 1 Fourth-Year Review15

2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	16
C Tenured Faculty	16
D Clinical Faculty	16
E Research Faculty.....	17
F Associated Faculty.....	17
G Salary Recommendations	17
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	18
A Criteria.....	18
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	18
Teaching and Extension	19
Scholarship.....	20
Service.....	21
2 Promotion to Professor.....	21
3 Clinical Faculty	22
4 Research Faculty	23
B Procedures	23
1 Candidate Responsibilities	23
2 Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	24
3 Department Chair Responsibilities.....	25
4 External Evaluations.....	27
5 Dossier.....	28
1 Teaching.....	28
2 Scholarship.....	29
3 Service.....	29
VII Appeals	29
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews	30
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	30
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	30
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	30

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 Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the department 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.

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

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's [policy on equal employment opportunity](#).

II Department Vision and Mission

Vision:

To be a global leader in food science and technology learning, discovery, outreach and teamwork.

Mission:

We inspire minds to improve food and impact the world with food science & technology.

Strategies:

- Recruit and train future leaders
- Create and disseminate knowledge that solves the most important food problems to improve the world
- Develop or continue science-based extension programs that promote food safety, quality, and innovation
- Foster an ethical and collegial environment for faculty, staff, students and stakeholders
- Provide a physical and administrative environment that facilitates productivity
- Increase visibility of subject matter expertise and thought leadership

III Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, contract renewal, 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, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

The Committee of the Eligible Faculty serves as the Promotion Tenure Committee for the Department of Food Science and Technology.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2 Clinical Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a clinical assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all clinical faculty in the department.
- For appointment (hiring) at senior rank (clinical associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

- For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of clinical associate professors, and the reappointment and contract renewal reviews of clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors, and all nonprobationary clinical professors.

3 Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.
- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

4 Conflict of Interest in the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

A conflict of interest exists when a member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, 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 (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who are co-authors on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since appointment or last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion or appointment review of that candidate.

5 Minimum Composition

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

B 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. A member of the eligible faculty on an off-campus assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved the off-campus assignment.

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

C 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. Faculty may participate by video or teleconference and send in their vote by voice or electronically.

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

IV Appointments

A Criteria

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Assistant Professor. An earned doctoral degree (or equivalent) is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the candidate and chair 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.

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

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally

entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior 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 (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

Distinguished and Endowed Professors and Chairs are expected to serve as role models for students and faculty, with high standards in ethics and integrity, and with a demonstrated record of exceptional achievements in science and technology.

2 Clinical Faculty

Appointment of clinical faculty entails a three-, four- or five-year contract. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Assistant Professor of Clinical Food Science and Technology. An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor of clinical Food Science and Technology. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

Associate Professor of Clinical Food Science and Technology and Professor of Clinical Food Science and Technology. Appointment at the rank of associate professor of clinical Food Science and Technology or professor of clinical Food Science and Technology requires that the individual have an earned doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

3 Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

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 appointments are not compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically, the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty. In the event that the department wishes to compensate an adjunct faculty member for work other than the voluntary service for which the adjunct title is provided, a concurrent appointment of limited duration for lecturer or other appropriate job title may be added for that purpose.

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 may be one to 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 may be one to 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 uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three 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, clinical, 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 Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured and nonprobationary clinical associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the

university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

See the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available.

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

6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Such appointment requires substantive academic potential or a record of achievement in one or more of these areas: extramural research collaboration with a FST faculty member; supervision of FST graduate students or staff; teaching FST credit hours, or outreach and service of benefit to FST. A courtesy appointment is at the candidate's current Ohio State rank, with subsequent promotions in rank recognized.

B Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, and research 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 Conflict of Interest in a Search and on a Search Committee

There are two types of conflict of interest in a search and on a search committee. Below are definitions and expectations for how each conflict will be handled.

(1) A member of the voting faculty must disclose to the chair of the search committee and the chair of the department, withdraw from the committee (if relevant), and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the process, in the event that the person:

- a. is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- b. is the current supervisor (excluding the department chair) or subordinate of a candidate;
- c. has substantive financial ties with the candidate (including serving as co-investigator on a sponsored research project); or
- d. decides to apply for the position.

(2) A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participating in search committee activities if the member:

- a. has substantive financial ties with that candidate;
- b. is dependent in some way on that candidate's services;
- c. has a close professional relationship with that candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor); or

- d. has collaborated extensively with that candidate, or is currently collaborating with that candidate.

2 Search for Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. Additional associated faculty members from within the department or faculty members from outside the department may be appointed to provide additional expertise to the committee. Tenure-track faculty members of the department will make up the majority of the voting members of the committee, although exceptions may occur if a search is joint with other departments. A student, staff, and/or stakeholder may be appointed to the committee, but only tenure-track faculty may vote. The department chair appoints the chair of the search committee who must be a tenure-track faculty member of the department. Normally they will be tenured and will not have chaired a departmental search in the last 3 years.

The search committee:

- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to tenure-track faculty, department chair and college approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, and salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally prominent professional journal.
- Solicits nominations and applications. All search committee members are expected to develop a list of candidates to recruit, and participate in phone calls or in person conversations with prospective applicants.

- Screens applicants and determines the applicants (usually 5-10) judged worthy of a video or telephone interview. Video or telephone interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office staff. A video or telephone interview must occur before an on-campus interview, except in rare circumstances.
- Optionally, further screens applicants by arranging for a half to one day in-person interview or “airport interview” with only the committee and department chair.
- Ensures that letters of recommendation are received, or phone interviews of references are conducted, prior to on-campus interviews.
- Ensures that applications and letters of recommendation (or summaries of phone interviews) are available for review by the tenure-track faculty.
- Determines the candidates to be brought in for on-campus interviews, and presents to the tenure-track faculty those applicants (usually two to four) judged worthy of on-campus interview. If the tenure-track faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the tenure-track faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the tenure-track faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, delay the search).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates normally make a presentation on their scholarship and teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. They may instead be asked to present their vision for a department chair search. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format. Normally, feedback will be collected from people who meet with the candidate.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the candidates, and to vote on the acceptability each candidate. Candidates cannot be ranked. No material may leave or be shared outside of this meeting, except with the college cabinet. At least two-thirds of all faculty eligible to vote must indicate whether a candidate is acceptable or unacceptable. Acceptability is determined by majority vote. The eligible faculty reports the vote on each candidate to the department chair.

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

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

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

3 Search for Clinical Faculty

Searches for clinical faculty proceed similarly as for tenure-track faculty, with the appropriate presentation(s) from the candidate during the on-campus interview, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college dean.

4 Search for Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty proceed similarly as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college dean.

5 Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a clinical or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure 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 clinical appointment and from a research appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Clinical faculty members and research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

6 Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the department chair.

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

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. A proposal that describes the qualifications of the individual and the planned uncompensated academic service justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting or by email. If approved by majority vote of the faculty, the recommendation is forwarded to the department chair.

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 an annual basis but can be made semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

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

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews below), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any FST faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. The candidate must present a seminar to the department, and distribute to the faculty their CV and a brief proposal, two page maximum, clearly addressing the criteria in IVA5, before the vote occurs. The department chair extends an offer of appointment upon a positive majority vote.

The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified. The chair, or any faculty member, can take recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting or by email.

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 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 reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; 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 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.

All members of the FST department must display civility, model constructive cooperation and

collaboration among colleagues, and foster classroom, lab, and office communities where people exchange different viewpoints while being respectful of one another. Civil behavior advances our mission and is consistent with the academic responsibilities and freedoms specified in [Faculty Rule 3335- 5-01](#).

A Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than January 31:

- Updated university and college required reports entered into VITA (see Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3) and REEPORT (for those with Hatch projects), using the currently required programs.
- Updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- Other requested information, such as impact statements and statement of faculty goals and activities for the coming year

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 chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

All probationary tenure-track faculty are also reviewed annually by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (all tenured faculty of higher rank than the faculty member under review). During the first, second, third and fifth year of the probationary period for assistant professors, the review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are not sought and the department chair makes the final recommendation regarding renewal of the appointment for an additional year, if the recommendation is favorable.

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

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

1 Fourth-Year Review

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

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

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

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

2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

C Tenured Faculty

Associate professors and professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

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 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.

D Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members include all of the non-tenure faculty titles defined in university rule [3335-7-02](#). The annual review process for clinical probationary and nonprobationary faculty is

identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except that non-probationary clinical faculty may participate in the review of clinical faculty of lower rank.

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

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

E Research Faculty

The annual review process for research probationary and nonprobationary 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 department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

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

F 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 department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss 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 department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

G Salary Recommendations

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. 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.

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 as appropriate. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

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

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion

Reviews

A Criteria

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 Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high- quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

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

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. 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. Outstanding performance in a tenure decision is required to advance the FST mission, vision and values. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. A performance below expectations in an area central to their responsibilities would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of their work, that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

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

The criteria listed are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. This unit evaluates all probationary faculty annually with these criteria, creating a formative record for improvement. In the mandatory year these criteria cease to be formative and are evaluative. It is unlikely that every successful candidate is outstanding in every criterion, thus the P&T committee letter provides important context for each criterion not achieved or is not appropriate. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

These criteria will be improved annually by the P&T committee. Suggested metrics are based on a rolling average of all Ohio State employment years and are not annual requirements.

Teaching and Extension

A promotion to associate professor with tenure expects excellence in most of these instructional and outreach criteria

1. Faculty should teach classes or workshops in extension events as assigned by the department chair. A typical expectation is one to three courses or equivalent per year in response to department needs.
2. Cumulative e-SEI reports, EEET and other evaluations of every class show a positive trajectory and rank relative to peers. Reports from team or guest lecture classes should clearly evaluate the candidate and not the course in general.
3. Documented feedback from students, alumni, or clients demonstrates valuable teaching contributions.
4. Quality advising and treating all students with respect and courtesy is documented.
5. Peer-review of teaching documents high quality teaching, and includes reviews of print, online and original lecture or laboratory materials. Evidence that instructional content is up to date with adoption of new materials.

6. Evidence of being an effective advisor for graduate committees, mentoring students, postdoctoral scholars and researchers. Recruits, advises and successfully graduates their graduate students.
7. Shows effective teaching including team-teaching, outreach and curriculum development. Creative use of innovative teaching methods is shown.
8. Awards for learning or outreach that recognize the candidate or their advisees.
9. Has produced outreach publications or factsheets, hosted workshops, given presentations, webinars or hands-on demonstrations.
10. Advances the FST mission through instructional and extension activities.

Scholarship

A promotion to associate professor with tenure expects excellence in most of these scholarly criteria:

1. Publishes peer reviewed articles, demonstrating a substantive contribution to knowledge in food science, with appropriate journal ranking, citation index, H-index, or impact on the field.
2. Innovative patent applications, invention disclosures, software, technology commercialization, startup companies or licensing.
3. Clearly explains appropriate contribution of the candidate on publications with graduate students and especially with faculty coauthors.
4. Collaborative scholarship with a clear role on projects with multiple researchers.
5. Successful grants from foundations, federal agencies, industry, state, local and internal (excludes departmental) entities as the P.I. or Co-PI. Maintains a strong, extramurally funded research program. Candidates must show measurable scholarly outcomes from funding and clearly explain their percent contribution on grants.
6. Documented evidence of building grant writing skills (as PI or Co-PI) via submitting annual extramural proposals equivalent to at least twice their salary.
7. Evidence that work in progress has future promise with a clear plan for continued extramural support.
8. A significant intellectual contribution to food science and food technology. A substantial body of scholarly work that advances our reputation in the food science and technology field.
9. External reviews document a positive impact of their program.
10. Evidence of high quality supervision of undergraduate research, graduate, post doc or staff investigators. Evidence of noteworthy student accomplishments and positions post-graduation.

11. Exemplary ethical conduct of research including treatment of undergraduate, graduate and professional students, residents, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.
12. Contribution to a positive work environment for faculty, staff and students.
13. Advancement of the FST mission through scholarly activities.

Service

A promotion to associate professor with tenure expects excellence in most of these service criteria:

INTERNAL

1. Peer evaluations by committee members that document excellence in service to department, the college and the university.
2. Evidence of high quality service on departmental and college or university committees. This may include appointments and elections to university, college, and department positions, such as STEP, UITL, faculty council, investigation or senate committees.
3. A clear statement of achievements in committee service.
4. Administrative responsibilities that enhance our work environment or expedites business practices, including supervision and review of FST staff employees or volunteers.
5. Advancing student achievement on product development teams, the Denman, college bowl, student clubs, Citation Needed, science fairs, peer mentors or honors research. Advancing student oversight such as judicial and academic misconduct.

EXTERNAL

6. Evidence of excellence in external service such as, elected or voluntary positions in major professional, regulatory, or honorary societies.
7. Substantive service to professional journals, scientific review panels, FDA or USDA advisories, and scientific societies.
8. Evidence of excellence in leadership in professional conference conception, organization or execution.
9. Leadership of centers or institutes that attract members, funding and increase the stature of this unit.
10. Expert professional activities that do not provide personal income.
11. Develop or continue food science-based outreach programs with documentation of the excellence and impact of each activity.
12. Advancement of the FST mission through service activities.

2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

A professor is expected to be a role model for other faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these responsibilities required. The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, outreach, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. In addition to these expectations, Distinguished and Endowed Professors and Chairs are expected to serve as role models for all faculty.

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.

In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

3 Clinical Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Professor of Clinical Food Science and Technology. For promotion to assistant professor of clinical Food Science and Technology, a faculty member must complete their doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service.

Promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Food Science and Technology. For promotion to associate professor of clinical Food Science and Technology, 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 associate professor-clinical are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Scholarship activity is not expected.

Promotion to Professor of Clinical Food Science and Technology. For promotion to professor of clinical Food Science and Technology, 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 this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy

and/or professional practice.

4 Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

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 demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

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](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the department.

1 Candidate Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. 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.
- The completion and submission of the dossier and promotion and tenure packet is the full responsibility of the candidate. All items, with the exception of the external letters, will be assembled and organized by the candidate. The candidate is responsible for making one complete PDF text file of the dossier and promotion and tenure packet in the required OAA format. This PDF may not contain graphical scans that are undetected by a word search. The PDF must be available to each member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted. Promotion and tenure packets that are not submitted within the deadlines established by the department chair will not be considered by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- To submit a copy of the APT document under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last

promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. The candidate must submit a PDF of the department APT document when the dossier is submitted to the department.

- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. 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. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To request review by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, in the year they plan to apply for a non-mandatory review. By February 1, the candidate must send their current dossier to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

2 Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in or after the 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. This meeting must occur before the deadline for the faculty member to submit their CV to be sent to external reviewers, on July 1. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. 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.
 - Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non- mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
 - 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 spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Early Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year, in a 1 year term. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines. The Procedures Oversight Designee is also responsible for resolving any perceived conflict of interest issues together with the department chair.
 - **Early Spring:** Select from among its members a Chair of the committee who will serve in this role for the following 3 years. The Chair cannot be the same individual as the Procedures Oversight Designee.
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair, through the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (Promotion and Tenure committee).
 - **Spring:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on 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.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, 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 to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - 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.

3 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Spring or Summer Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of 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 remove any member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting, when possible.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letters are accompanied by OAA form 103 that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not they are submitting 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, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation of candidates

holding a minority (<50%) joint appointment in our department, during 4th and mandatory years. This is sent to the head of the majority (≥50%) tenure home by the date requested.

4 External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a clinical faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

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. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. 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 during the spring or summer semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty through their chair, 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.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must

inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

5 Dossier

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 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 the candidate.

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

- Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

1 Teaching

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. Examples of documentation include but are not limited to:

- cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including number, provided in Section X below)
- exit interviews, evaluations, and individual feedback from students and advisees
- copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction

- involvement in curriculum development
- awards and formal recognition of teaching
- presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
- adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

2 Scholarship

Recognizing that scholarship is a process of growth, candidates may include materials in this section from throughout their career. While all scholarly/creative works can be listed, the primary time period for review in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present; and for tenured or nonprobationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include but are not limited to:

- copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- documentation of grants and contracts received
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
 - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
 - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

3 Service

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include but are not limited to:

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
 - clinical services
 - administrative service to department
 - administrative service to college
 - administrative service to university and Student Life
 - advising to student groups and organizations
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
- any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

VII Appeals

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

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

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for 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 (eSEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching. Faculty members are also encouraged to collect student feedback of their own design, throughout the semester.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Annually the department chair, typically through the Academic Affairs Committee, appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee for each person to be reviewed that year. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the 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, this model will normally be followed.

The responsibilities of the Peer Review of Teaching Committees and Academic Affairs Committee are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned
- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary associate professors of clinical Food Science and Technology at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least two peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- To review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary professors of clinical Food Science and Technology at least once every four years 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 upon request 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 may provide ideas for improvement, documentation of excellence for awards, or other evidence to improve our instructional program.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [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 chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the peer reviewer should ideally meet with the candidate 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.