

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

DEPARTMENT OF HORTICULTURE AND CROP SCIENCE

College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences
The Ohio State University

OAA Approved: October 9, 2025

Table of Contents

I. PREAMBLE	4
II. DEPARTMENT MISSION	4
2.1. Mission of the Department	4
2.2. Vision for the Department	5
2.3. Departmental Principles	5
2.4. Faculty Values	5
III. DEFINITIONS	6
3.1. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
3.1.1. Tenure-track Faculty	6
3.1.2. Professional Practice Faculty	7
3.1.3. Research Faculty	7
3.1.4. Associated Faculty	8
3.1.5. Conflict of Interest	8
3.1.6. Minimum Composition	9
3.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee	9
3.3. Quorum	10
3.4. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	10
3.4.1. Appointment	10
3.4.2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	11
IV. APPOINTMENTS	11
4.1. Criteria	11
4.1.1. Tenure-track Faculty	11
4.1.2 Professional Practice Faculty	12
4.1.3. Research Faculty	13
4.1.4. Associated Faculty.....	13
4.1.5. Emeritus Faculty	14
4.1.6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	15
4.2. Procedures	15
4.2.1. Tenure-track Faculty	15
4.2.2. Professional Practice Faculty	17
4.2.3. Research Faculty	18
4.2.4. Transfer from the Tenure-track	18
4.2.5. Associated Faculty.....	18
4.2.6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	19
V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW	19
5.1. Documentation	20
5.2. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	20
5.2.1. Fourth-Year Review	21
5.2.2. Extension of the Tenure Clock	21

5.3. Tenured Faculty	21
5.4. Professional Practice Faculty	22
5.5. Research Faculty	22
5.6. Associated Faculty	23
5.7. Salary Recommendations	23
VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	24
6.1. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion.....	24
6.1.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	24
6.1.2. Promotion to Professor	30
6.1.3. Professional Practice Faculty	30
6.1.4. Research Faculty	31
6.1.5. Associated Faculty	31
6.2. Procedures	31
6.2.1. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty	32
6.2.1.1. Candidate Responsibilities	32
6.2.1.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	36
6.2.1.3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	38
6.2.1.4. Department Chair Responsibilities	38
6.2.2. Procedures for Associated Faculty	39
6.2.3. External Evaluations	40
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS	42
VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS	42
IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	42
9.1. Student Evaluation of Teaching	42
9.2. Peer Evaluation of Teaching (Resident instruction and Extension Teaching)	42
Appendix 1. Peer Review of Classroom and Extension Teaching	43
Appendix 2. Example information to facilitate peer review	48
Appendix 3. Tools available for evaluation of Extension teaching	49
Appendix 4. Faculty Mentoring.....	50

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#)); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#)); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject. Should those rules and policies change, the department 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair will be responsible for keeping the document in conformance with College and University Guidelines and with other policies of the Department. Recommendations for revision of the document will be brought to the faculty by the Chair of the P&T Committee, after consultation with the Department Chair. Recommendations for changes must be provided to faculty 30 days in advance of a meeting at which a vote will be taken. A two-thirds majority of the eligible voting faculty at the faculty meeting will be required for a positive recommendation for approval of changes to the document. Following approval by the faculty, if the Department Chair accepts the recommendation by the faculty, the proposed changes will be forwarded for approval by the College and Office of Academic Affairs.

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 the [policy on equal employment opportunity](#).

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

2.1. Mission of the Department

We sustain life and grow the future for Ohio and our world through innovative plant science.

The mission of HCS is to obtain knowledge about plants and their uses through innovation and discovery, and then disseminate that knowledge to benefit Ohio State University, the people of Ohio, and the world. We provide outcomes that advance plant science and benefit the agronomic

and horticultural related industries. We advance knowledge and innovate through our research, teaching, and extension efforts.

2.2. Vision for the Department

We strive to be the preeminent global leader for discoveries via translational plant science research and knowledge dissemination.

This is accomplished through innovative and creative educational programs, scientific discovery, the development of novel technology, and delivery of technology to the citizens of Ohio, and the world.

HCS will work collaboratively, in goal-oriented teams to provide centers of excellence and quality programs in teaching, research, and outreach. We will foster a climate of open communication, creative thinking, resource acquisition, and departmental ownership among faculty, staff, and students.

2.3. Departmental Principles

To be one of the best plant science departments in the world, we must target our efforts to establish areas of excellence, recruit and challenge the most motivated and talented people, pursue academic excellence as a way of life, and recognize that quality is the most essential characteristic of all programs and personnel. There must be 1) open communication, 2) encouragement and support of innovation and risk-taking, and 3) opportunities for all faculty, students and employees to develop to their highest potential. Teamwork, individual initiative, and leadership are critical ingredients in our organization. Programmatic priorities must be consistent with our mission and sensitive to societal needs. We expect all faculty, students, and employees to take personal responsibility for the quality of their work, and their personal/professional growth and development. The results of our programs and the students we teach are a source of pride for the whole Department.

Members of the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science acknowledge that they are scientifically and professionally involved with the interdependence of natural, social, and technological systems. They are dedicated to the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge that advances the sciences and professions involving plants, soils, and their environment.

In an effort to promote the highest quality of scientific and professional conduct among its members, the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science endorses the following guiding principles that represent basic values of our profession.

2.4. Faculty values:

Collegiality, civility, mutual support, and respect for others are strongly held values in HCS. The department supports the free exchange of ideas and expect that faculty, staff, and students promote these values and apply them in a professional manner in all academic endeavors. HCS is committed to evaluating the practice of these values as part of all performance evaluations. In all aspects of their work, faculty members are expected to demonstrate collegial, civil, responsible and respectful behavior toward peers, staff, students, and stakeholders. Faculty members are encouraged to establish and maintain a rapport with their colleagues. Both personal accomplishments and involvement as a team member are essential for excellence in teaching and

mentoring, research, extension outreach and/or administrative service. Each faculty member contributes indirectly to the department's productivity by positively influencing the productivity of other faculty. This synergism may include positive interactions in team teaching, mentoring and advising, research collaboration, co-authorship of publications, sharing of innovative ideas in committee meetings, stakeholder, community, and industry outreach, and other cooperative efforts that advance the missions of HCS, CFAES and the University. It is important that all faculty members work towards establishing and maintaining a team culture and an enriching intellectual working and learning environment.

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the quality of academic life by participation in departmental, college and university governance and administrative service activities. The department values enthusiasm, innovation, creativity, intellectual diversity, and open-mindedness. HCS is committed to academic freedom and encourages free expression. Faculty members should be open to new ideas and respectful of the ideas and opinions of others.

Each member of HCS contributes directly to the department's productivity through personal accomplishments that further our mission areas. In addition, each member of HCS also contributes indirectly to department's productivity by positively influencing the productivity of others. This synergism may be seen in the creation of our learning environment, research collaborations, co-authorship of publications, a team approach to curriculum and course development, and sharing of innovative ideas in committee meetings and our interactions with stakeholders, industry partners and the community at large.

All faculty and staff should work toward establishing and maintaining a team culture and an enriching intellectual working and learning environment. HCS is committed to evaluating the practice of these core values as part of all performance evaluations.

III. DEFINITIONS

3.1. 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.

3.1.1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

3.1.2. 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 faculty and all professional practice and research faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary 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 nonprobationary professional practice associate professors, and all nonprobationary 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 nonprobationary professional practice professors.

3.1.3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3.1.4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, all professional practice faculty, and all research faculty in the department.

Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary professional practice faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all those with non-probationary professional practice titles and tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.

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

3.1.5. 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.

3.1.6. Minimum Composition

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

3.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The P&T Committee shall consist of five faculty elected from among tenured Professors and tenured Associate Professors with the latter comprising at least one, but no more than two of the members. The Committee will have at least one member with a primary appointment in each of teaching, research or extension. The Committee will have members from both the Wooster and Columbus campuses. Committee members will serve three-year staggered terms. Election of

new members will be completed using a timetable that will facilitate the annual schedule for P&T activities (generally February through November). Re-election to the Promotion and Tenure Committee is possible after two terms (six years) have passed since the end of a three year term on the committee.

The P&T Committee will elect a Chair-designate from within the Committee, who will be a Professor, and will serve a one-year term as an understudy to the committee Chair (which may extend their term of service). The Chair-designate will become committee Chair in the following year. The Chair-designate will also serve as the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD). The Department Chair and Associate Chairs are ex-officio, non-voting members of this Committee. However, their attendance at P&T meetings is crucial, providing the Committee with a broad perspective of each candidate's performance, resource allocations, and other elements that might be difficult for the Committee to assess or obtain through documentation available to it.

When considering cases involving professional practice faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by two non-probationary professional practice faculty members. When considering cases involving research faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by two non-probationary research faculty members.

3.3. Quorum

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

3.4. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

“Yes” and “no” votes are counted on personnel matters only; 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.

3.4.1. Appointment

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

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their appointment.

3.4.2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when a simple 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 tenure.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

4.1. 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.

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.

4.1.1. 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 Department Chair, the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be

revoked 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 doctoral degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Conditions for interruption of the tenure clock are specified by OAA. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the candidate (in conjunction with the Promotion and Tenure Committee) considers 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 exclude time from the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor - Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meets 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 the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur.

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

4.1.2 Professional Practice Faculty

Within the Department of Horticulture and Crop Science, Professional Practice faculty are teacher/practitioners who are engaged primarily in teaching activities related to courses or instructional situations involving professional skills.

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

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 or has not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment as Professional Practice Instructor 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 - A terminal degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience, and the required licensure/certification in his or her specialty are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Assistant Professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

Professional Practice Associate Professor and Professional Practice Professor -

Appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professional Practice Professor requires that the individual have: i) an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field; ii) the required licensure/certification in his/her specialty; and iii) meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

4.1.3. 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.

4.1.4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple of 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 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. 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 faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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 should generally not exceed one year.

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 should generally not exceed one year.

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, and 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 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 consecutive years at 100% FTE.

4.1.5. 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.3.1) 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.

Emeritus faculty hold nonsalary appointments. Emeritus faculty members are invited to participate in departmental activities and programs; however, they may not vote in the governance of the Department or participate in promotion and tenure decisions. Office,

laboratory, and other facilities may be provided to emeritus faculty members, depending on the available resources and the stated needs of the retired individual. The Chair makes all decisions regarding use of facilities. Use of departmental resources will be evaluated yearly by the Chair.

4.1.6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

4.2. 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.

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

4.2.1. 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 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](#).

New positions to be filled in the Department will be determined through faculty discussion of priorities and needs that contribute to the Department, College, and University Strategic Plans. The Department will follow the CFAES faculty position request procedure. The Chair will designate the EAC (or ad-hoc committee) to assist in developing a "Faculty Position Request", the language of which will include the core of a position description. The "Faculty Position Request" will be made available to all faculty for discussion and approval by a majority vote at a regular, or called, faculty meeting with a quorum present.

The Department Chair will submit the faculty-approved “Faculty Position Request” describing the position, proposed responsibilities, and justification to the CFAES Administration for approval to initiate a search. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise. After the “Faculty Position Request” is approved by the College, the Chair submits a Faculty Position Authorization Request, which does not require additional approval by the faculty.

The Department Chair will submit names for a search committee in accordance with the requirements of the College, consisting of three or more departmental faculty (majority of committee), a departmental staff member, a student, and an external member (faculty or stakeholder). Selected faculty will reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the Department. The Department Chair will appoint one of the search committee members to serve as Chair. Following approval of this committee from the College, the Department Chair and Search Committee will work with the CFAES Administration to conduct the search.

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

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

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified, varied talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit EEO goals and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not

requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.

- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

After the interview process is completed, the Search Committee will present summaries of the feedback collected for each candidate at a meeting of the eligible faculty for discussion. Following the meeting, the Search Committee will conduct a vote whether the candidate is ***acceptable*** or ***not acceptable*** for the position using an electronic ballot. 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. If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer involves prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty report a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the Department Chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The Department Chair will make a recommendation to the Dean or their designee regarding an offer from the pool of acceptable candidates. When authorized by the Dean to make an offer, the Department Chair will offer the position to the selected candidate in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean. 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.

Potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residency or nonimmigrant work-authorized status must be discussed 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.

4.2.2. 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, letters of recommendation, and a teaching statement. A departmental Search Committee

will be formed as described for tenure-track positions to review applications from qualified candidates to present to the Department. Potential candidates will provide a teaching seminar and interview with the eligible faculty. The Search Committee will solicit comments from faculty, staff, and students and present a summary to the eligible faculty for discussion. The discussion will not only focus on the strength or weakness of the candidate, but breadth of knowledge and ability to teach in the desired course topics. A vote of the eligible faculty will be taken and provided to the Chair who will determine whether to proceed with hire. A two-thirds majority vote will indicate faculty approval of the candidate.

4.2.3. 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. A departmental Search Committee will be formed as described for tenure-track positions to review applications for qualified candidate to present to the department. Potential candidates will provide a research seminar and interview with the eligible faculty. The Search Committee will solicit comments from faculty, staff, and students and present a summary to the eligible faculty for discussion. The discussion will not only focus on the strength or weakness of the candidate, but relevance of their research plan to needs of the department and any potential overlap with an existing program or research area. A vote of the eligible faculty will be taken and provided to the Chair who will determine whether to proceed with hire.

4.2.4. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a professional practice 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 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.

4.2.5. 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 4.2 above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department Chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Executive Advisory Committee. 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 and are decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Executive Advisory Committee. Final approval is made by the college.

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, 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.

4.2.6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT 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 to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual performance and merit review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching (resident and extension), scholarship, and/or service, as set forth in the Department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload (see POA, Section IX); on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.

The annual review is the primary means by which the faculty performance and achievement are evaluated, and serves as a basis for 1) formal communication between the Department Chair and faculty member regarding accomplishments of the previous year and plans for the next year, 2) a component in the determination of annual merit salary recommendations, 3) assisting faculty in professional development, 4) calling attention to performance problems where they exist, 5) praising exceptional performance, 6) for untenured tenure-track faculty, serving as a component of monitoring progress toward tenure, and 7) for faculty at assistant and associate ranks, serving as a component of monitoring progress towards promotion. 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.

5.1. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair, typically within five weeks following the end of the review year:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

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.

5.2. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

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

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

If the Department Chair recommends non-renewal, 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.

5.2.1. 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 exceptions 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.

5.2.2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may extend the probationary period. [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 department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

5.3. Tenured Faculty

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. The Department Chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written

comments on the review. All reviews and comments will become part of the Faculty member's personnel file.

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/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 provide written comments on the review.

5.4. Professional Practice Faculty

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

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

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

5.5. Research Faculty

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

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

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

5.6. Associated Faculty

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

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

5.7. 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.

The 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.5.7 above) for an annual 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

6.1. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews: *In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching (resident instruction and extension), 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.*

6.1.1. 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. There is an expectation that the Faculty member will continue to maintain a program of high-quality teaching, research, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

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

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

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' [Statement on Professional Ethics](#). Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. It is recognized that these positive attributes characterize the ability of a faculty member

to effectively contribute to exemplary scholarship, teaching and service. A commitment to these values and principles can be demonstrated by constructive responses to and participation in departmental and college initiatives. Examples include participation in faculty governance, outreach and service, ethical behavior, adherence to principles of responsible conduct of research, constructive conduct and behavior during the discharge of duties, responsibilities and authority.

The criteria and evidence depicted in the charts below in the areas of teaching, research, and service are expected of faculty members for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. 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.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	• 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 demonstrate instructional content up-to-date • Experts in field evaluate and determine syllabi, class evaluation items and class materials up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience • External faculty expert reviews 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 the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	
Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom or online technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	• Cumulative eSEI reports or other teaching evaluations such as trainee evaluations, Med-Star, or TIU/college specific evaluation forms for every class • eSEI items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 scores equal or greater than average for TIU or college or goal score determined by TIU, i.e. greater than 4.0 • eSEI items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 scores demonstrate positive trajectory during review period • eSEI item 10 scores equal or greater than average for TIU or college or goal score determined by TIU, i.e. greater than 4.0 • Positive peer evaluation documenting these areas demonstrate positive trajectory during review period • Positive evaluations from Continuing Education Programs, both internal and external to the university

Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, critical thinking, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	• Use of multimodal techniques or approaches to stimulate class participation and learning – discuss in teaching narrative • Peer evaluation descriptions positive on mode of instruction • eSEI items 2, 8, 9 scores equal or greater than average for TIU or college or goal score determined by TIU, i.e. greater than 4.0 • eSEI items 2, 8, 9 scores demonstrate positive trajectory during review period
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students/residents throughout the instructional process	• Demonstrated an understanding of the needs of outreach learners • Effective teaching materials and programs as measured by outcomes and adoption of the materials or programs • Creativity in subject matter development, methods of presentation and the incorporation of new ideas • Positive evaluations of presentations provided through outreach education • Evidence-based presentations meeting the needs of the learners
Treated students/residents with respect and courtesy	• Positive qualitative student/resident comments • Feedback on Carmen/Canvas sites
Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs	• Positive qualitative student/resident comments • Positive peer evaluations • Exit interview summaries demonstrating respect and courtesy
Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the TIU's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise	• Involvement and specific outcomes in curriculum development • Leadership in development of the curriculum and courses which goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations
Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	• mentoring of undergraduate research students • promoting student participation in research presentations (e.g., Denman) • serving as mentor or committee member for honors research theses

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

TEACHING EXTENSION AND OUTREACH EDUCATION

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated engagement with stakeholders in the mission of Extension	• An understanding of the needs for knowledge by outreach students and clientele. • A contemporary command over subject matter and the ability to glean from the subject matter what is useful for identifying and resolving problems. • Creativity in subject matter development, methods of presentation, and the incorporation of new ideas. • The ability to communicate effectively with outreach students, both orally and in writing. • The development of effective teaching programs and materials. • The ability to anticipate the "teachable moment" regarding the needs of outreach students and to respond with appropriate educational activities.

- **Research** - For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others.

RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated thematically focused research/scholarship/creative outcomes that contributes to knowledge in area of expertise within the context of the position and relation to the department mission, scientific community, and stakeholder needs	• A body of work in peer reviewed journals, or other journals consistent with the standards of the appropriate unit, and/or conferences of high quality that clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research/scholarship/creative program over time, and contributes substantively to knowledge/outcomes in the area of focus. Publications demonstrate research/scholarship/creative focus. • 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. • Refereed conference publications considering the conferences involved are recognized as refereed, highly selective, and of high quality. The visibility of the conference as a focal point for research in the area should be clearly established. • 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 • Outcome indicators, between faculty expertise and project objectives/constituent needs • Creation of digital media, software, patents, and fact sheets – related to outcomes

	• Description of significant outreach activities in which the faculty member played a major role, with qualitative indicators to evaluate the excellence of each activity • Major external awards from national/international agencies, associations, and private foundation • Keynote lectures/presentations at conferences, symposia, and other organizational field specific workgroups. • Testimony on scholarship expertise to bodies of Congress
Demonstrated successful entrepreneurship	• Patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials transfers • Technology commercialization • Formation of startup companies • Licensing and options agreements • Consulting work with industry and other external partners
Demonstrated high quality research/scholarship/print or digital scholarship/creative outcomes	• Publication in peer reviewed books, journals, and monographs • Journal ranking, citation index, H-index, impact on field • Primary journal of faculty member's discipline • Engagement/outreach: scholarly recognition including peer reviews of the activity and its results • Creation of digital media, digital humanities projects, software patents, and fact sheets • Grants and contracts designed to develop and deliver outreach innovations • Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses • List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, outreach, or creative work • External reviewer positive comments
Demonstrated impact of research, scholarship or engagement	• Individuals from outside the state or nation have sought candidate and want to study the outreach provider's work and innovations • Significance of problem addressed: how serious was the problem or need; what social, economic or cultural consequences could have resulted from not addressing the problem or need • Citations in other works • Inventions, patents, disclosures, options, and commercial licenses • Intellectual property such as copyrighted materials, software, multimedia presentations • Materials transfer agreements suggest recognition of one's work and can be one component of national/international impact
Demonstrated unique contribution to a line of inquiry	• External peer reviewers comment that the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession in an area and the extent to which that person has been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioners • Consistent contribution demonstrating expertise to multiple scholarly, research or engagement outcomes • Scale of the problem: what are the size, trends, future directions and geographic distribution of the problem • Narrative describing the activity, the reasons why it was undertaken, the faculty member's intellectual contribution

	and leadership role, and how the activity contributed to his/her/their scholarly advancement • Uniquely creative approaches to framing research questions, with unique cultural or demographic impact of the work in publications or grant proposals
Demonstrated the candidate's ability to conduct work and to mentor future scholars	• Candidate advising a group of graduate students at varying stages of progress in their own development as apprentice researchers • Evidence of support for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students including, but not limited to, financial, grants, and positive mentoring reviews • Undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and residents' advisee awards • Student positions post-graduation • Student success related to mentored work (productivity, dissemination, awards, scholarships, grants) • Evidence of recruiting and mentoring of varied student backgrounds
Demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research and scholarly program funding.	• Competitive peer-reviewed research funding – national or international grants from funding agencies including government agencies and private foundations, and associations that require outcomes • Grants and contracts designed to develop and deliver outreach or engagement innovations • Contribution to the collaboration of research outcomes as a member of a team or interdisciplinary cluster • Unique thematic focus (expertise) consistently provided to the scientific outcomes of the scholarship • Defined pattern of contribution to interdisciplinary cluster
Demonstrated a high degree of professional ethics	• High degree of ethical conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of undergraduate, graduate and professional students, residents, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators • Contributes to a positive and compelling working environment, particularly one that welcomes all faculty, staff and students

Service. The Department of Horticulture and Crop Science deems service to programs of the Department, College, University and professional organizations as a responsibility of each faculty member. It is recognized that service will vary among faculty members and for a faculty member over time depending, in part, on the specific faculty appointment.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated excellence in service	• Active participation in departmental governance • Participation and leadership of, committees, boards, offices, working groups, or task forces of the department, college, university, professional societies, foundations, or stakeholder groups. This includes appointed and elected positions

	• Contributions to the research, Extension, and teaching community through hosting of social media discussion sites and boards, editorships, manuscript and grant reviews, grant panel service, workshop or meeting planning, and other similar activities demonstrating utility to the profession.
--	---

6.1.2. 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.

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure (see charts in preceding section), with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university.

6.1.3. Professional Practice Faculty

For promotion to Professional Practice Assistant Professor, a faculty member must complete his/her doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in his/her specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service.

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.

Scholarship activity is not expected. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

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 this 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.

6.1.4. Research Faculty

For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted to research, and a provider of effective service. 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 will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

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, and leadership in service to the Department and related academic societies. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

6.1.5. Associated Faculty

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

For 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 4.1.5.

Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

6.2. 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 Chapter 3 of the [*Policies and Procedures Handbook*](#).

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

6.2.1.1. 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 fully consistent with the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (which must include using OSU's current electronic reporting system). 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 Promotion and Tenure 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 him/her/them.

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.

Teaching

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

Examples of teaching documentation (resident instruction) include:

- 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 provided in the Appendix to this document)
- 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

Documentation and evaluation of Extension/Outreach Education includes the following:

- Development and delivery of outreach education programs (lessons, courses, and curricula).
 - The number of outreach lessons or programs developed and the depth and breadth of subject matter included.
 - The number and scope of courses of study (series of multiple lessons) developed.
 - Participation in the development of a curriculum of study (series of courses).
 - Involvement in program planning and development at the county, multi-county, state, regional, national and international levels, including the development of proposals for program funding and success thereof.
 - Formal evaluations of extension meetings and programs and other outreach education activities.
 - Letters of evaluation solicited by a third party (e.g. Department Chair).

Development of teaching materials for outreach education.

- The number and scope of written teaching plans or programs, discussion guides, and related educational materials for use in teaching and for adoption by other outreach educators such as field extension faculty, industrial trainers, and other natural resource managers.
- The number and scope of visual, audio, and computerized (software packages) teaching aids, and evidence of use by other educators.
- Publications authored, co-authored, or edited.

- Peer-evaluated publications designed primarily to communicate with other educators or to serve as basic references, e.g., extension bulletins, journal articles, books and book chapters, proceedings, etc.
- Popular and technical articles designed primarily to communicate timely subject matter directly to outreach students and the general public, e.g., articles in citable news magazines, newspapers, trade journals, newsletters, etc.
- Fact sheets and other printed or electronic means of disseminating small but significant pieces of information that have been evaluated and approved by peers.
- Web pages, postings to on-line bulletin boards or other services that have been evaluated and approved by peers.
- Professional and society presentations, including volunteered and invited papers/posters, presented before professional societies on the subject of Extension or outreach education.
- Teaching
 - The number, subject matter scope and depth, and location of outreach education classes taught, and the number of students involved in each.
 - Peer review of outreach teaching.
 - Written assessment by other faculty members who have collaborated in team teaching.
 - Written assessment by Extension field faculty, the Extension Coordinator, Director, or designated representative on at least a biennial basis with input from Extension administrators and District supervisors where appropriate.
 - Written evaluation by individuals who are in target audiences for presentations and/or other educational products.
- Mediator of knowledge between the University and the public.
 - Utilization of print, broadcast, and electronic media for knowledge dissemination to outreach students and the public at large.
 - Consultation with existing and potential users of outreach education, including farmers, industry and agribusiness operatives, leaders in agricultural and community organizations, and other educators, regarding program recognition and the identification of on-going and emerging needs and opportunities for outreach education on subjects within the faculty member's areas of expertise.
- Impact of programs upon related practices and other activities. Recognition or awards for distinguished extension education.
- Election to positions of leadership in organizations concerned with outreach education and participation in professional organizations associated with teaching and extension education.
- Unsolicited letters from outreach students, including extension clientele, and others involved in outreach education.

Research

For research 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.

Examples of documentation include:

- 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

Service

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

Examples of documentation include:

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
- involvement with professional journals and professional societies
- consultation activity with industry, education, or government
- professional practice service(s)
- 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

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

If external evaluations are required candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add two more names (or a third name, if one of those names is unavailable to provide an evaluation), 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.)

6.2.1.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

- Review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- Consider on an annual basis, 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. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will not vote on non-mandatory reviews, but will provide an honest and fair assessment to the candidate regarding the suitability of dossier for review. 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. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary 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 recommendation by the Committee to move forward with a review 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 Semester: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The POD's responsibilities are described [here](#).
- Late Spring Semester: Suggest names of (5-9) external evaluators to the Department Chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section 6.2.3 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
- Late Spring Semester: Review each candidate's dossier 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.
- Late Spring Semester: The Promotion and Tenure Committee, or a designated representative from the Promotion and Tenure Committee, will meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Early Autumn Semester: 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. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Early Autumn Semester: Revise the draft analysis of each case following the eligible 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.
- Mid-Autumn Semester: Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Mid-Autumn Semester: Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another Department. 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.

6.2.1.3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

Ballots will be provided to eligible faculty members to render a positive or negative vote on the candidate. These ballots will be placed inside of two envelopes, the outer envelope bearing the name of the eligible faculty member. This is to keep track of which faculty have received ballots. After marking the ballot, the faculty member will insert the ballot in the inner (unmarked) envelope and return it to the Chair of the P&T Committee or his/her designee. The P&T Committee will record that each faculty member has voted and, after all sealed envelopes have been collected, votes will be pooled and counted by two P&T Committee members.

The responsibilities of the members of the voting eligible faculty (those who attended the meeting to discuss a candidate) are as follows:

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's entire dossier, including documentation describing accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service as they pertain to the criteria outlined in this document, 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. Every eligible faculty member is expected to vote on P&T decisions. Abstentions will not be included as part of the total vote.

6.2.1.4. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. The department will ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- Late Spring Semester: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. 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.

- 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.
- Charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- Remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- Attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- Mid-Autumn Semester: Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- 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 and of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair, as well as the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten (10) days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- Forward the completed dossier to the CFAES office by that office's deadline.
- Receive the Promotion and Tenure 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 Department Chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

6.2.2. 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 6.2.1 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), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

6.2.3. External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs, recognizing that:

When seeking external evaluators for faculty promotion and/or tenure cases, the Department considers both peer and aspirational institutions, with the specific programs selected depending on the faculty discipline under review. In general, our aspirational programs are agronomy, horticulture or plant science programs from Michigan State University, Iowa State University, and Purdue University. Depending on the discipline, typical peer programs include agronomy, horticulture, or plant science programs from The Pennsylvania State University, Cornell University, Texas A&M University, University of Florida, University of Georgia, University of Nebraska, University of Wisconsin, and Kansas State University. The Department recognizes that the most appropriate peer and aspirational institutions may vary according to the candidate's area of expertise, and the list of programs will be tailored accordingly for each case.

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

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for professional practice or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a professional practice faculty member will be made by the Department Chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure 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 can give an "arms' length" evaluation of the research

record and 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 only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State University. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests. The Department Chair may contact potential evaluators to determine they are available (i.e. have time within their work commitments) and willing to provide a letter of evaluation.

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, in the course of the review process.

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

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

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

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

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

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

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-05](#) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for 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

9.1. 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.

9.2. Peer Evaluation of Teaching (Resident instruction and Extension Teaching)

The Department Chair (or designated to Associate Chair) oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process as described in Appendix 1.

Appendix 1. Peer Review of Classroom and Extension Teaching

Annual review of teaching will be required for all faculty engaged in teaching (resident instruction or extension teaching). A formative review conducted at the request of the faculty member is considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Probationary Tenure-Track, Probationary Professional Practice Faculty, and Associated Faculty:

Classroom Teaching - The Tenure Mentoring Committees appointed by the Department Chair will be responsible for peer review teaching.

1. The Mentoring Committee will review at least one course per year, however peer review of multiple courses within a year is permitted and encouraged. If multiple courses are taught by the faculty member, the course to be reviewed will be decided based on discussion between the faculty member and his/her Mentoring Committee.
2. Components of the peer review may include (but are not limited to) the following:
 - The Worksheet for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (see Appendix 1A).
 - Review of the Syllabus for the course (see Worksheet, Appendix 1A).
 - Review of examinations, handouts, visual aids and Carmen website used in the course (see Worksheet).
 - A visit to classroom sessions of the course by different members of the Mentoring Committee. In lieu of classroom visits by members of the Mentoring Committee, other faculty may be asked to participate in review of the course and these visits will be organized by the Mentoring Committee Chair. Worksheets will be filled out following these visits and supplied to the Mentoring Committee Chair.
 - A review of SEI scores – to be supplied to the Mentoring Committee Chair by the instructor as soon as they are available. Mentoring Committees that are advising untenured faculty with classroom teaching responsibilities should become familiar with the [SEI process](#).
3. The Mentoring Committee will meet informally with the faculty member to discuss teaching performance based on the above inputs. This discussion should include a critical analysis of performance and explicit recommendations for improving classroom teaching skills. Evaluation Worksheets should identify areas where teaching can be improvement.
4. A written record of the peer review will be prepared by the Mentoring Committee Chair; this record will be forwarded to the Department Chair and will become a part of the annual performance review and permanent P&T record.

5. Untenured faculty members are encouraged to communicate and share ideas and course materials with faculty at other institutions where similar courses are being taught. Sharing of ideas and teaching materials with other institutions will strengthen the record presented at the 4th and 6th year reviews for Promotion and Tenure and this documentation (e.g., letters) should be included in the P&T application.
6. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair (or designee) to monitor annual activity in mentoring of classroom teaching. The Department Chair will make changes in the composition of the Mentoring Committees where appropriate progress is lacking.

Extension Teaching - The Tenure Mentoring Committees appointed by the Department Chair will be responsible for Peer Review.

1. The Mentoring Committee will work with the faculty member to identify opportunities for evaluation. Information supplied by the faculty member should include dates and places where important teaching activities will occur and other OSU faculty who will be in attendance at these activities. (See example in Appendix #2).
2. The Mentoring Committee Chair will work with the faculty member to implement the review process. It is anticipated that other faculty in attendance at an Extension meeting will be able to assist the Mentoring Committee in handing out evaluation forms, etc. The faculty member to be reviewed may provide the evaluation forms to the person responsible for conducting the evaluation at the Extension meeting or workshop. However, the completed forms are to be returned directly to the Chair of the Mentoring Committee. Two or more activities/presentations should be evaluated per year.
3. Mentoring Committee members will attend at least two presentations each year in order to gain a first-hand impression of the quality of teaching skills. In lieu of visits by members of the Mentoring Committee, other faculty may be asked to participate in review of the presentations and these visits will be organized by the Mentoring Committee Chair.
 - Components of reviews of Extension teaching will include (but are not limited to) the following: Group EEET scores, Peer EEET scores, and Expert EEET evaluations. (Copies of the three forms are attached as Appendix #3.) (As this policy is implemented, EEET scores obtained in previous years will be included in the record.)
 - Evaluations of performance provided by various Extension teams and organizations such as the Extension Nursery Landscape and Turf team, the Agronomy teams, AmeriHort, the Ohio Soybean Association, and the Ohio Wheat Growers Association are important for development of teaching skills and should be considered in the evaluation of Extension teaching. These evaluations will be supplied to the Mentoring Committee by the faculty member.
 - Appropriate client feedback available from County Agents.
 - A statement of the goals and expectations for the program supplied by the Extension faculty member.

- Written materials and visual aids, including fact sheets, bulletins, web sites, newsletters, etc. prepared by the Extension faculty member in support of the program.
4. The Mentoring Committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss teaching performance based on the above inputs. This discussion should include a critical analysis of performance and explicit recommendations for improving teaching skills. A written record of the Peer Review will be prepared by the Mentor Committee Chair (or designee) will be supplied to the faculty member and a copy will be forwarded to the Department Chair and will be a part of the permanent P&T record.
 5. Untenured faculty members are encouraged to communicate and share ideas and program materials with faculty at other institutions where similar Extension programs are offered. Sharing of ideas and teaching materials with other institutions will strengthen the record presented at the 4th and 6th year reviews for Promotion and Tenure and this documentation (e.g., letters) should be included in the P&T application. Expert EEET evaluations from faculty at other institutions will also provide useful documentation of the quality of the program.
 6. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair and the P&T Committee to monitor annual activity in mentoring of Extension teaching. The Department Chair will make changes in the composition of the Mentoring Committees where appropriate progress is lacking.

Tenured Associate Professors and Nonprobationary Professional Practice Faculty:

Classroom Teaching - Reviews will be obtained annually for faculty members who have teaching responsibilities for a given academic year. To initiate the process, the chair of the Department's Academic Affairs Committee will solicit from the faculty member the names of three faculty members who would be appropriate reviewers. From this list the AAC chair will select a single reviewer and inform the Department Chair of the appointment. The faculty member being reviewed will then supply the designated reviewer copies of all the appropriate support material (syllabus, handouts, tests, etc.).

The review process will proceed as described under the relevant portions of Sections I.A.4.a, b, c, d, and e. The differences here are that the review will **not** involve a Mentoring Committee and only one classroom visit will be necessary. Other faculty and the Department Chair may be involved in the reviews as deemed appropriate by the faculty member conducting the review. The reviewed faculty member should meet with the reviewer to discuss informally where the areas of teaching effort can be improved. This analysis should include a review of Worksheets for teaching evaluation and SEI scores. The discussion may include other faculty members who have participated in the review. No written record of these discussions is required.

For Associate Professors, the reviewer will also write a report summarizing the review, which will become part of the P&T record. This report is to be addressed to the Department Chair and copied to the faculty member reviewed. The peer evaluation is to assist in documenting growth. A continuous improvement method should be used for all levels – review, list of strengths and

weaknesses, means for improving and outcomes on improvement. For Professors, the reviewer will inform the Department Chair (or designee) that the review has been completed.

Extension Teaching - Tenured faculty who have Extension appointments or who regularly participate in Extension activities shall be reviewed annually. Faculty who anticipate application for promotion to Professor should obtain peer reviews several years in advance of their application for promotion, regardless of appointment split in Teaching, Research, and Extension.

The faculty member will initiate the review process and provide the Department Chair (or Associate Chair if so designated) with the names of three faculty who would be appropriate reviewers. From this list, the Department Chair (or designee) will select a single reviewer. The faculty member being reviewed will then supply the designated reviewer with opportunities for program review during the upcoming year (i.e., extension presentations to be given), and all appropriate support materials (fact sheets, visual aids, etc.).

Completed EEET forms and other evaluations of performance will be returned to the faculty member responsible for the review. The review process will proceed as described under the relevant portions of Appendix 1, above. The difference here is that the review will not involve a Mentoring Committee. The reviewed faculty member will meet informally with the reviewer to discuss areas where the extension teaching effort can be improved. This discussion may include other faculty members who have participated in the review for Associate Professors, the reviewer will also write a report summarizing the review. This report is to be addressed to the Department Chair (or Associate Chair if so designated), and the faculty member reviewed. An effort should be made to focus on the positive aspects of the teaching activity. For Professors, the reviewer will also inform the Department Chair (or designee) that the review has been completed.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching Worksheet

Classroom Teaching

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

Comments on Classroom Teaching:

Appendix 2. Example information to facilitate peer review.

Appendix 2

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

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

OSU Sweet Corn School

Friday November 16, 2001

2 presentations

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

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

Greenhouse Growers Meeting

Thursday November 29, 2001

Seville, OH (CropKing, Inc.)

Mary Donnell

Washington/Meigs County Vegetable School (tentative)

Wednesday December 12, 2002

Washington State Community College; Marietta, OH

Eric Barrett, Hal Kneen, Mac Riedel, Celeste Welty

Muck Crop School (tentative)

Thursday or Friday January 17 or 18, 2002

Willard, OH

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

MidAtlantic Fruit and Vegetable Convention

Tuesday January 29, 2002

Hershey, PA

2 presentations

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

Ohio fruit and Vegetable Growers Congress

Thursday and Friday February 7 and 8, 2002

Toledo, OH

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

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

Southwest Ohio Fruit and Vegetable School (tentative)

Thursday February 21, 2002

Morrow Vineyards, Morrow, OH (Warren County)

Appendix 3. Tools available for evaluation of Extension teaching

- The following tools can be found [here](#):
 - Cover sheet for EEETs
 - Group EEET form
 - Peer EEET form
 - Expert EEET form
- [Department of Extension Peer Evaluation of Teaching for Faculty](#)
- A peer evaluation should address the following six topic areas:
 - Curriculum Choice and Development
 - How Faculty Member Promotes Learning
 - Faculty Member Preparedness
 - Strategies for Instruction
 - Evaluation of Learning
 - Summary Comments

Appendix 4. Faculty Mentoring

Assistant Professors

Within two months after a new faculty member begins work, the Chair will assign the new faculty member a Mentoring Committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty (or three faculty whose rank is at least Associate Professor when mentoring Professional Practice Assistant Professors). Committee members may be appointed from outside the Department. A minimum of two committee members must be HCS faculty.

The committee's role is to provide information, support, and candid feedback to the faculty member during the probationary period. It is expected that the Mentoring Committee will meet with the new faculty member at least twice per year to discuss progress of the candidate in establishing a strong program and progress toward tenure and promotion. Following each meeting of the Mentoring Committee, the committee chair will provide a written report of the meeting to the Department Chair.

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

Duties of the Mentoring Committee are:

- Meet with the candidate twice annually,
- Provide feedback on the candidate's dossier annually
- Provide Peer Review (Resident Teaching or Extension Teaching) to the candidate, annually, as described in Appendix 1.

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

Associate Professors

Within a year from receiving tenure, Associate Professors will identify a Mentoring Committee comprised of one Professor and the Department Chair. The role of this Mentor Committee is to provide information, support, and candid feedback to the faculty member during their career. The Mentor Committee should not accelerate nor slow the progress of the Associate Professor towards promotion but should serve as a resource for the Associate Professor to plan and develop their career. The Mentoring Committee should meet at least annually to review:

- Peer Evaluation of Teaching and/or Extension reports
- SEI (or other) reports

- Annual performance reviews
- Feedback from grant applications
- The candidate's dossier

The Associate Professor can change the faculty member on their Mentor Committee with approval from the Department Chair.