

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

Department of Plant Pathology

College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

The Ohio State University

Approved by the Department

December 2025

Provisionally Approved by OAA: December 5, 2025

Original version approved by the Department of Plant Pathology, April 1997; revisions approved by Department of Plant Pathology, January 1998; September 2001; January 2005; September 2008, October 2014, August 2020, December 2025

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	Department Mission and Vision.....	3
A.	Mission.....	4
B.	Vision	4
III.	Definitions	4
A.	Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	4
B.	Promotion and Tenure Committee	8
C.	Annual Performance and Merit Review Committee	9
D.	Quorum.....	9
E.	Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	9
IV.	Appointments.....	10
A.	Criteria for appointment.....	10
B.	Search and appointment procedures	16
V.	Annual Performance and Merit Reviews	22
A.	Documentation	23
B.	Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	24
C.	Tenured Faculty	26
D.	Professional Practice Faculty	26
E.	Research Faculty	27
F.	Associated Faculty	27
G.	Salary Recommendations	27
VI.	Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion	29
A.	Criteria and documentation that support promotion	30
B.	Procedures.....	36
VII.	Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals.....	48
VIII.	Seventh Year Reviews	48
IX.	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	48

I. Introduction

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 of the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and other policies and procedures of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CFAES or “the College”) and The Ohio State University (OSU) to which the Department and its faculty are subject. Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair. This document must be approved by the Dean and Vice-President of Agricultural Administration of CFAES (the “Dean”) and the Executive Vice President and Provost (the “Provost”) before it may be implemented.

This document sets forth the Department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure, and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Dean of CFAES and the OAA accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

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

II. Department Mission and Vision

The Department of Plant Pathology was established in 1967 as a unit of the College of Agriculture (now the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences), at The Ohio State University. We are proud to remain one of the few stand-alone departments of Plant Pathology in the United States.

Our mission and vision statements were approved by the faculty of the Department on October 6, 2014, as follows:

A. Mission

We are dedicated to enhancing food security, global sustainability, and human welfare through environmentally and economically sound strategies for plant health management. To this end:

- we conduct fundamental and mission-oriented research on pathogenic and beneficial microbes, and their interactions with plants and the environment, to broaden our understanding of plant disease at biological scales ranging from the molecular to the epidemiological, and
- we educate students, professionals and the general public about the science of plant pathology and innovations in plant health management.

B. Vision

Our vision is to lead globally in research, education, and the delivery of unbiased science-based information on plant diseases, host-microbe interactions, and plant health management.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

Decisions on recommendations for appointment, promotion, and tenure are made by the committee of Eligible Faculty. The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the Department.

The Department Chair, the Dean and Assistant and Associate deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

1. Tenure-track faculty are faculty members with tenure or in a tenure-track position whose appointments may focus on teaching, extension, research, graduate advising, and service to the Department, College, University, and professional societies.

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial 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 then 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 and the tenure reviews of untenured associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the promotion reviews of associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

2. Professional practice (clinical) faculty are those non-tenure-track appointments that focus primarily on teaching, undergraduate and graduate student engagement, and service.

Appointment Reviews

- Initial 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 faculty in the department.
- Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must then be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Research faculty are non-tenure track faculty whose appointment focuses primarily on research, graduate student advising, and service.

Appointment Reviews

- Initial 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 research faculty in the Department.

- Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must then be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and 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 research associate professor and research professors.
- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of research associate professors and the reappointment reviews of research professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all research professors.

4. Associated Faculty who are regularly appointed in this department are adjunct faculty (primarily employees of the United States Department of Agriculture – Agricultural Research Service), and visiting faculty. The department also occasionally appoints lecturers and tenure-track faculty with FTE below 50%.

Initial Appointment and Reappointment of Adjunct Faculty

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) and reappointment of adjunct faculty members are decided by the Chair following a vote of the eligible faculty.
- On initial appointment, eligible faculty are all those with professional practice titles and all tenure-track faculty members.
- 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 of Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty in this department are eligible for promotion but not tenure. For the promotion reviews of adjunct faculty, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1 above.

Appointment of Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty appointments are made by the Chair, as described in Section IV.B.6 below. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only

three consecutive years. Visiting faculty are appointed at the same or equivalent rank they hold at their own institution. Visiting faculty are not eligible for promotion.

Appointment of Other Compensated Associated Faculty

Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) and reappointment of lecturers and tenure-track faculty appointed at less than 50% are decided by the Chair following a vote of the eligible faculty (all those with professional practice titles and all tenure-track faculty members).

Promotion Reviews of Other Compensated Associated Faculty

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

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

5. Conflict of interest

• Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

• Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;

- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

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

6. Minimum composition

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

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, as described in the POA, assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The P&T Committee consists of three tenured Professors and the Chair (ex officio). At the beginning of each academic year, one or two new members are elected to serve 2-year terms beginning September 1. At least one new member is elected every year and the senior member then rotates off the committee after serving their term. Members of the committee are elected by the entire faculty in the Department. It is desirable that an individual not serve for consecutive terms. It also is desirable that one elected member on the Committee to be from each campus (Columbus or Wooster).

The chair of the P&T committee is elected by the entire faculty for a one-year term but can be reelected for a second one-year term. An ex officio member, i.e. the Chair, cannot serve as the chair nor POD. Each year, the P&T committee also elects one of its members as the 'Procedures Oversight Designee' or POD. If a member of the P&T committee cannot serve, due to illness or other cause, then the Chair shall appoint a replacement.

The P&T POD will work to ensure that: the review body at each level follows written procedures governing the reviews; the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner; and the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members, which include underrepresented groups that could bias the review. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review should first be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (Chair, Dean, or Executive Vice President and Provost, depending on the level of the review).

C. Annual Performance and Marit Review Committee

The Department Annual Performance Review (APR) Committee. As described in the POA, the APR Committee evaluates the extent and quality of the teaching, extension-outreach, student advising, research and service; engages each person in a constructive, evaluative discussion of their performance; and makes recommendations to the Chair regarding the content of the Chair's annual performance review letter written to those being reviewed by this process. The Committee consists of five persons: 1) the Chair, 2) at least one full Professor, and two to three additional faculty members (any rank, preferably one each from the Columbus and Wooster campuses) who are elected by the eligible faculty at the beginning of the academic year in which the review is held. The Associate Chair serves as non-voting *ex officio* member, and the Chair serves as chair of the APR Committee.

D. 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 leaves of absence 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 (POA IX.B.5) may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

E. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Abstention is not an option on votes for promotion and tenure. 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.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty that a faculty candidate is acceptable to the department must receive a two-thirds vote.

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

2. Reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment,

promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are positive.

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

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria for appointment

The Department of Plant Pathology commits itself to appointing to the faculty only those persons who will enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the Department and advance its mission. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, 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. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure-track faculty

Criteria for appointment shall follow the rules applying to tenure-track faculty as described in [Chapter 6](#) of the Rules of the University Faculty.

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor

occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

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

Assistant Professor. A minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is completion of an earned doctorate in plant pathology or a related field of study. In addition, the candidate must have a record of scholarly achievement that demonstrates, as judged by the faculty, a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment.

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

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

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. An appointment as Associate Professor will generally entail tenure.

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

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

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

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

2. Professional practice faculty

Professional practice faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). The initial contract for all 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.

Responsibilities of professional practice faculty:

- Professional practice faculty will be responsible for teaching courses in the discipline of plant pathology.
- Professional practice faculty may contribute to undergraduate and graduate recruitment and advising but may not serve as the primary advisor.
- As members of the department, professional practice faculty will be expected to serve on departmental committees as assigned by the Chair.
- Scholarly activities in the realm of education and mentorship.
- Professional practice faculty will be expected to attend faculty meetings and participate in faculty discussions / deliberations.

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate degree (*or appropriate terminal degree*) in his or her specialty and evidence of instruction experience are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of professional practice assistant professor of Plant Pathology. Evidence of ability to mentor students is highly desirable.

Professional Practice Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at the rank of professional practice associate professor or professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate (*or appropriate terminal degree*) and meet, at a minimum, the department's expectations as expressed in their job

description in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship for promotion to these ranks.

3. Research faculty

Criteria for appointment shall follow the rules applying to research faculty as described in the Rules of the University Faculty, [3335-7](#). Research faculty appointments are fixed one-to-five-year term contract appointments that do not entail tenure. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Research faculty are researchers and shall be engaged in research related to the mission and goals of the Department. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

Responsibilities of research faculty:

- Research faculty will be responsible for maintaining a productive and financially solvent program. The same measures of research productivity applied to tenure-track faculty will apply to research faculty, with the exception of graduate student training.
- Research faculty will be allowed to co-mentor graduate students but not serve as the primary advisor.
- As members of the department, research faculty will be expected to serve on departmental committees as assigned by the Chair.
- Research faculty will be expected to attend departmental meetings and participate in faculty discussions and deliberations.

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, which include sustained publication record and evidence of continued external funding.

4. Associated faculty

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

Associated faculty include compensated and non-salary faculty who serve the Department in some significant capacity but are not in tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty positions at the University. Compensated associated faculty who are hired to perform a specific service may include adjunct faculty, visiting faculty on leave from other academic institutions, or, occasionally, lecturers or tenure-track faculty appointed at less than 50% FTE. Non-salary associated faculty may include visiting faculty on leave from other academic institutions and adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty include government scientists (primarily employees of the United States Department of Agriculture – Agricultural Research Service) who are housed within the Department and other allied professionals who contribute in a significant way to the academic work of the Department. Associated faculty appointments are made for up to three years and require formal renewal if they are to be continued.

Adjunct faculty, whether or not they are housed within the Department (see Associated Faculty in Section IV.B. below), will be expected to have substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department, including such activities as participation or substantial collaboration in departmental research programs, advising students, providing seminars or guest lectures in courses, serving on departmental committees, and/or appropriate outreach activities. Adjunct faculty will hold titles of Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor.

Visiting faculty who hold academic titles at other academic institutions will be appointed at the same or equivalent rank they hold at their own institution with the modified title of Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

Tenure-track Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50% must hold an earned terminal degree. Such appointments may be either compensated (1 – 49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

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

subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

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

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 Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured and non-probationary professional practice associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate, submit it to the Dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

6. Joint appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a [memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications,

the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

7. Courtesy faculty

Tenure-track faculty members from other TIUs within OSU may be given appointments as courtesy faculty in the Department if they are substantially involved in the academic work of the Department. Courtesy faculty are encouraged to participate in other departmental activities and programs.

Courtesy appointments are made at the same rank held in their home Department. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal, but continuation will require ongoing contributions to departmental activities.

B. Search and appointment procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy

must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

1. Tenure-track faculty

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

The Chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search as well as other strategically aligned fields within the department.

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

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

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment

process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.

- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

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

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the dean decides which candidate to approach first following consult with the Chair. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Chair following approval from the dean.

It is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An [MOU](#) must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2. Professional practice faculty

Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for

tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interview is on professional practice rather than scholarship.

3. Research faculty

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

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

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

5. TIU Transfer

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

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

The Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

6. Associated faculty

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal

search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair following a vote of the eligible faculty.

The reappointment of all compensated associate faculty members is decided by the department chair following a vote of the eligible faculty.

Requested appointments for *visiting faculty* usually come to the Department as a result of an association with an individual member of the faculty and plan to work in their laboratory for a defined period of time while on leave from their own institution. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years, or on an annual basis for up to three years. Visiting faculty appointees must submit specific, written plans for scholarly activities to be undertaken during the time the visiting faculty member will be in residence in the Department.

Adjunct faculty usually come to the Department as a result of: 1) their employment as a scientist within a unit of a governmental research organization (usually the United States Department of Agriculture) located on the Columbus or Wooster campus; 2) their interest in direct participation or collaboration in the academic programs of the Department; and 3) the Department's willingness to provide them with office and/or laboratory space. Request for an adjunct appointment in the Department for a government scientist will usually follow appointment of the person to a scientific position by the governmental agency and may be initiated by the scientist or by faculty members of the Department. In some cases, requests for adjunct status may come from allied professionals not in residence within the Department (i.e., not using office and/or laboratory facilities under departmental control) who wish to participate in the academic programs of the Department. In all cases of requests for adjunct status, complete, updated curricula vitae of the candidate will be submitted to the Chair who will transmit copies to all department faculty. At a faculty meeting, a letter from the candidate will be presented to indicate his/her interest in joining the Department with adjunct faculty status, and outline the role that he/she intends to take in the academic programs of the Department. Adjunct status will be granted upon a positive vote of two-thirds majority of the eligible faculty (see Section III.A.4) and approval of the Chair and the Dean. Adjunct faculty may participate in all Departmental activities but are not accorded voting rights. The activities of adjunct faculty resident within the Department will be reviewed annually by the same procedures used for faculty, discussed herein in Section V. The activities of all other adjunct faculty will be reviewed annually by the Chair and brought to the attention of the faculty. If at any time the faculty of the Department judge that any adjunct member of the faculty has not maintained a substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department, renewal of adjunct status can be disapproved by majority vote of the faculty, effective at

the end of any annual appointment period. If adjunct status is revoked, further use of departmental space and facilities will be reevaluated and may be denied by the Chair if no longer deemed appropriate.

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

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

7. Joint appointments

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.7. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

8. Courtesy faculty

Request for a courtesy appointment in the Department for a faculty member from another tenure initiating unit within the University may be initiated by that person or by faculty members of the Department. A complete, updated curriculum vitae of the candidate will be submitted to the Chair who will transmit copies to all Department faculty. At a faculty meeting, the candidate's letter will be presented to indicate his/her interest in joining the Department with courtesy faculty status, and outline the role that he/she intends to take in the academic programs of the Department. Courtesy faculty status, at the same rank as in the TIU, will be granted upon a two-thirds majority vote of the faculty and approval of the Chair. Courtesy faculty may participate in all departmental activities but are not accorded voting rights. The activities of courtesy faculty will be reviewed annually by the Chair and brought to the attention of the faculty. If at any time the faculty of the Department judge that a courtesy member of the faculty has not maintained a substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department, courtesy faculty status can be disapproved by majority vote of the faculty, effective at the end of any academic year. If courtesy status is revoked,

further use of Departmental space and facilities, if any, will be reevaluated and may be denied by the Chair if no longer deemed appropriate.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Reviews

The Department of Plant Pathology continues a longstanding tradition of conducting two types of annual peer reviews of faculty performance, each with a unique and specific purpose. The Annual Promotion and Tenure Review is held each May or June by the departmental P&T Committee. At this time, the P&T committee meets individually with each tenure-track faculty member to obtain his/her views on the progress towards promotion and tenure of each promotion-eligible tenure-track faculty member.

Similarly, the P&T committee contains tenure track faculty member views for promotion of professional practice and research faculty. Membership on the P&T committee, the role of the P&T committee in annual reviews for promotion and tenure, and the procedures used by this Department for evaluation of all eligible faculty for promotion and tenure are discussed in Section VI of this document. Further discussion of annual reviews in this section shall be limited to the second peer review procedure used by this Department, the Annual Performance and Merit Review.

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

- Evaluate the extent and quality of the teaching, extension, student advising, research, and service activities of each member of the Department faculty during the previous calendar year,
- Engage each faculty member in a constructive, evaluative discussion of his/her performance,
- Review with each faculty member their plans for the coming year as outlined in their annual statement of responsibilities and expectations and any associated changes in their Position Description, and
- Make recommendations to the Chair regarding the content of the Chair's annual performance review letter written to each eligible faculty member.

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

chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

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

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

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair by a specified date in January:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- An annual performance review document (*all faculty*) prepared according to format specified by the Chair, to include:
 - all accomplishments by the faculty member in teaching, extension, student advising, scholarship, and service during the previous calendar year and any indicators of quality or impact of performance, either as an individual or member of a team;
 - an outline of his/her plans for the coming year, and
 - a position description that briefly outlines the overall responsibilities of the position in the areas of teaching (classroom and extension), research and/or creative scholarly work, outreach, and service, and any requested changes in this description

- 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.

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Annual Performance Review Committee (APR) and by the department chair.

The APR committee consists of at least five persons: 1) the Chair; 2) at least one Professor who has completed one year's service on the P&T committee; 3 and 4) two additional faculty members (any rank, preferably one each from the Columbus and Wooster campuses) who are elected by the voting faculty at the beginning of the academic year in which the review is held; and 5) the Associate Chair serves as non-voting ex officio member. The Chair serves as chair of the APR Committee. Election of members normally occurs in September of the year prior to the review and they serve on the committee for a 1-year term. If any of the four elected members of the APR committee becomes unavailable and cannot serve on the review, then the Chair shall appoint a replacement.

Members of the APR committee have access to the performance review documents of all probationary tenure-track faculty members and are requested to read them prior to the actual review. Review sessions are conducted in person (preferred) or via video link on two separate days on the Columbus and Wooster campuses. In each session, the APR committee meets with each faculty member. During the meeting, the faculty member is given the opportunity to highlight their most significant accomplishments during the previous year. Members of the committee ask pertinent questions and provide constructive feedback to the faculty member on their performance and plans for the coming year. Any proposed changes in the position description are discussed, but changes must be approved by the Chair in private dialogue with the faculty member. A make-up review session is held for faculty who are unable to schedule their review during the primary meetings of the APR committee.

Following completion of all reviews, the APR committee makes recommendations to the Chair regarding comments that should be included in the annual performance review letter written to each probationary tenure-track faculty member. The Chair then prepares performance review letters for each faculty member. These letters include

background information on their current appointment (including percentage OSUGF/OSUE/OARDC, as described in IV.C. of this document) and years since appointment. Comments address performance during the last calendar year in teaching and/or extension, research, and service, as compared with goals set at the last review and the position description. Comments address plans for the coming year and suggestions for improvement are included as appropriate. The Chair prepares the final letters if edits are warranted, delivers them to each faculty member, and places a copy in their personnel file. If a faculty member wishes to write a response to her/his performance review letter, he/she may do so, and a copy of the response will be attached to the copy of the performance review letter that is retained in the faculty member's personnel file, becoming part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure. Individual faculty members can schedule follow-up meetings with the Chair to discuss the review, if so desired.

If the Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year. The Chair's letter (along with the faculty member's response, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college.

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

1. Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the 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 solicited only when either the 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 Chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the

probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the departmental review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the Chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

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 exclude time from 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.

C. Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed by the Annual Performance Review Committee, as described in Section V.B above and using the same process.

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

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

The Chair's performance review letter includes background information on an associate professor's or professor's current appointment (as described in Section V.B) and years since last promotion. Other areas of focus are the same as those described above for probationary faculty.

The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

D. Professional Practice Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for professional practice probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track and

tenured faculty, respectively, except that non-probationary professional practice faculty may participate in the review of professional practice faculty of lower rank.

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

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Research Faculty

The annual review process for probationary and non-probationary research faculty is identical to that described above for tenure-track and tenured faculty, respectively.

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

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

F. Associated Faculty

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

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the Chair who 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 Chair's decision on reappointment is final.

G. Salary Recommendations

The Chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months. Specific consideration will be given to performance during the previous year, the record of

performance during the past several years, the appropriateness of the salary level with regard to the individual's overall record of accomplishments, and to compensation to others within the college and peers at comparable institutions. Consideration also will be given to the achievement of any specific written goals as specified in the previous annual performance review letter to the individual from the Chair.

The chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

Faculty may request to discuss their merit raise recommendations with the Chair. Compensation decisions should support the recruitment, performance, and retention of high quality and productive faculty.

Acceptable work is required of all faculty members; exceptional work will be rewarded. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate continued intellectual engagement as members of this Department. Annual salary increases will be given to faculty based solely on meritorious performance, except when an across-the-board increase for all employees is mandated by the University.

Faculty performance will be evaluated in light of individual contributions made to the advancement of the Department's mission. The roles and responsibilities of individual faculty with regard to components of the departmental mission vary considerably and are reflected by their appointment; however, all tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to advise graduate students and to engage in scholarly activity.

The mission of the Department and the necessity for positive interactions and contributions within the community of scholars cannot be achieved without the demonstration of faculty citizenship and collegiality. All tenured, tenure-track, professional practice and research faculty members are expected to make positive contributions with respect to academic service, contribute to and participate in professional organizations and activities, and contribute to and participate in the academic functions of the Department. Areas of participation include attendance and participation in seminars, invited speaker programs, departmental meetings, faculty meetings, committee meetings, student activities where faculty participation is expected or invited, etc. Faculty members also are expected to demonstrate respect and responsible behavior towards administrators, peers, staff, students, and clientele. In this regard, a record of good citizenship within the Department will be an important consideration when evaluating performance for the determination of salary increases. Special consideration will be given to faculty who provide extraordinary service, but this will not relieve them of demonstrating excellence in teaching and other scholarly activities.

Faculty who are on professional leave, serving as visiting professors, or participating professionally in approved off-campus assignments, will not be penalized by loss of a

salary increase while away from the Department. In these cases, the faculty member will provide the Chair and Associate Chair with a timely progress report of his/her activities containing sufficient information for their review.

Cash payments as part of the compensation process may be provided in accordance with the annual guidelines issued by the Provost and the Senior Vice President of Talent, Culture and Human Resources. In all cases, a brief summary of the reason for the cash payments is documented.

A faculty member who has a concern about their salary or annual adjustments to their salary should schedule a meeting with the Chair to discuss their concerns. If they are still not satisfied, they may appeal their case to the College Investigation Committee. In order to be eligible to have their appeal considered, an individual must 1) be a faculty member, 2) have not had a salary appeal decision rendered by this body in the last three academic years, and 3) demonstrate that their salary is at least 5% below the average salary of all other faculty in the Department of the same rank. Appeals to the Investigation Committee must be initiated no later than October 31 in order to facilitate completion of the review before salary recommendations are made for the next academic year.

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

VI. Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion

The award of tenure to tenure-track faculty and of promotion to Associate and Professor for tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved and demonstrates a strong case for continued excellence, depending on their faculty appointment type, in research, teaching or extension, and has provided effective service to the Department, College, University, and/or profession. It should be emphasized that faculty have appointments in one or more areas from three funding sources: OSUGF, OARDC, and OSUE. Thus, faculty members' performance shall be evaluated in the context of their position description, and their agreed-upon annual goals, with primary emphasis given to areas where the individual has more substantial commitments.

Teaching in the Department of Plant Pathology includes activities such as formal (credit-earning) classroom teaching, continuing education, advising undergraduates and graduate students, directing thesis research and independent study projects, and/or extension (outreach) education. Depending on their appointment, an individual may have responsibility for guest lectures in several formal OSU courses or have full responsibility for one or more courses. For extension or outreach education, teaching includes presentations and lectures, workshops, in-service' training, short-courses,

demonstrations in grower 'field-days', preparation of written and electronically distributed educational materials, one-on-one instruction, diagnostic and professional practice activities, and other non-degree educational programs.

Research in the Department occurs through individual or team-based accomplishments that lead to the generation of some element of creative or innovative activity that is peer reviewed and published in an appropriate form, licensed technology or patented inventions and invited scholarly presentations. Typically this involves research in any aspect of the nature of plant pathogens and plant associated microbes, management of plant diseases, and their impact on society and their interaction with the environment; however, this also may include creative activity in any area relating our discipline to human society and its needs and/or to the development of new and innovative methods for teaching and extension in areas of expertise within plant pathology. To be considered scholarship, an activity must: 1) lead to the creation of something that did not exist before; 2) be validated by peers and/or by external sources; and 3) exemplify one or more of the forms of discovery, integration, transformation, or application.

Service is expressed as: active participation in committees of the Department, College, or University; service to the profession and to professional organizations; and application of professional expertise in service to the community, state, nation, and internationally. In all cases, a high standard of Departmental and University citizenship is required as part of the service expectations for promotion and tenure. Citizenship is shown in terms of positive contributions to departmental, College, and University committees; participation in departmental activities; maintaining a high level of collegiality; and working towards the improvement and advancement of the Department, College, and University. Service will be part of the consideration given during promotion and/or tenure review, but such special ability or performance in service will not relieve the candidate of demonstrating excellence in the other areas of their appointment.

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

A. Criteria and evidence that support promotion

1. Tenure-track faculty

Promotion to rank of Associate Professor with tenure

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

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the

University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

As specified by [Chapter 6](#) of the Rules of the University Faculty, tenure will not be awarded below the rank of Associate Professor. The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must be based on evidence that the faculty member: 1) has achieved excellence as a teacher, Extension professional, and as a researcher; 2) provides effective service; and 3) can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, research, Extension, and service relevant to their specific appointment and the missions of the Department, College, and University. Every candidate will be held to a high overall standard of excellence, but the nature of the appointment and assigned responsibilities will be of major importance in evaluating the candidate. Excellence in scholarship must be demonstrated for promotion, and this scholarship can be in research, Extension, or teaching depending on the appointment; that is, clear demonstration of excellence is essential in the areas central to the candidate's assigned responsibilities. A less than excellent performance in the area of primary responsibility cannot be counterbalanced by excellence in an area of lesser responsibility. While effective or excellent service is not given a percentage in an appointment, as part of academic, institutional, and professional communities, it is expected that service to these entities be practiced on a continuing basis and that leadership and outcomes be documented in the dossier.

Listed below are examples of criteria that will be used for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Each core activity, as it applies to a faculty member's appointment, needs to be addressed. The examples are not a checklist where each item is required, rather they represent key demonstrators of excellence that will focus review of the dossier.

Teaching and Mentoring

Core Activity

Examples to demonstrate excellence in Core Activity

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement in curriculum development at department, college, or university level • Leadership in development of the curriculum and courses which goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations • Production of pedagogical papers, textbooks, monographs and compilations of essential education resources, including online teaching resources • Creation of digital, simulation, or other learning tools
Demonstrated ability to educate and mentor future scholars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising a group of graduate students and postdoctoral trainees at varying stages of progress in their own development as apprentice researchers • Evidence of support for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students as well as postdoctoral trainees • Undergraduate, graduate, and professional student as well as postdoctoral advisee awards • Student positions post-graduation • Postdoctoral trainee positions following departure from OSU • Student postdoctoral trainee success related to mentored work (productivity, dissemination, awards, scholarships, or grants)

Research

Demonstrated thematically focused research/ scholarship/ creative works that contribute to knowledge in area of expertise within the context of the position and in relation to department mission, scientific community knowledge advancement, and stakeholder needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A body of work in peer reviewed journals, or other journals consistent with the standards of the department and in line with expectations of the discipline, and/or conferences of high quality, which clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research/scholarship/creative program over time and contributes substantively to knowledge/outcomes in the area of focus that is cited or otherwise shows evidence of influence on the work of others • Publication record that includes 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, or invention disclosures • Sustained grants and contracts that may include funding from foundations, federal agencies, industry partners, or private sector. These may be as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator with documented focused contributions • White papers that can be shown to have influenced policy or practice • Creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including collections, compositions, curated exhibits, multimedia, radio, recordings, television, and websites
---	---

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Demonstrated successful entrepreneurship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	---

Extension

Demonstrated engagement with stakeholders in the mission of Extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Body of focused, high-quality research/scholarly/creative works that are disseminated appropriately in the practice of Extension • Body of work published and/or presented in high quality peer reviewed venues (books, journals, scholarly conferences, etc.) that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and cited or otherwise shows evidence of influence on the work of others • Regular engagement with stakeholders and stakeholder groups (i.e., commodity groups, boards, and communities) through farm and production site visits, prompt replies to written and electronic inquiries, presentations at meetings/conferences, and other similar means • Timely response to new or endemic pathogen outbreaks • Dissemination of the use and efficacy of pathogen control chemistries or practices • Training of stakeholders on the application and implementation of control chemistries and practices • OSU Extension publications/media releases of information for stakeholder use • Collaborative funded scholarship with defined intellectual contribution to multiple project(s) • Sustained program funding from grants and contracts that may include state and federal sources, industry support, commodity group funding, donations, and foundation awards
---	--

Service

Demonstrated excellence in service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation in, 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 • Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to department, college, university, professional societies, foundations, or stakeholder groups
------------------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guiding student groups that include clubs, sororities/fraternities, honors or discipline specific cohorts, or campus-based programs and initiatives such as STEP • Serving in an administrative position in the department, college, or university
--	---

Promotion to rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member: 1) has a sustained record of excellence in classroom teaching, student advising, and/or extension (outreach) education; 2) has produced a significant and focused body of research that is nationally or internationally recognized for its impact on the field of plant pathology or related areas of science; and 3) has demonstrated leadership in service. Individuals seeking promotion to professor will be assessed in relation to the nature of their position description (OSUGF, OARDC, OSUE) and assigned responsibilities. Exceptional performance in scholarship (research or teaching) and leadership in the areas with greatest responsibilities are required. Sample criteria provided above for the promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor apply to the promotion to Professor with that caveat that there is an expectation that the faculty member demonstrate leadership and a national/international reputation in each realm of their responsibilities as well as service. The Department expects an individual that is worthy of promotion to Professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Promotion to Professor will not result from simply performing adequately for a given number of years as an Associate Professor.

2. Professional Practice Faculty

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

Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor. For promotion to professional practice associate professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this Department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to professional practice associate professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor

with tenure. If scholarship activity is required, this must be noted. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor. For promotion to professional practice professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to 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.

3. Research Faculty

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

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

4. Associated Faculty

Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor. The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

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

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

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

B. Procedures

General considerations

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

Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty

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 that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#). Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs [Candidate Checklist](#) without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

While the 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 or her.

All candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate and document clear excellence in teaching (degree granting or extension/outreach), research, and service. The nature and extent of the contribution will be commensurate with assigned responsibilities and the amount of time allocated for each activity.

- **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 non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Documentation of teaching excellence for all candidates shall consist of student and peer evaluations; however, specific documents will depend on the type of teaching activity in which the candidate is involved. For example, evaluation of extension outreach teaching will be substantially different from evaluation of credit-based classroom teaching. In all cases, however, excellence requires demonstrated high-level of accomplishment for most of the following measures of teaching as appropriate for the position description:

- Mastery of the subject matter;
- Continuous growth in subject matter knowledge;
- Ability to organize and communicate class material with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm;
- Objectivity;
- Contributions to curricula or program development;
- Creativity in course or program development, methods of presentation and incorporation of new materials and ideas;
- Capacity to enhance students' awareness of the relationship between subjects studied, important problems, and other fields of knowledge;
- Advising undergraduates, graduate students, post-docs, and extension clientele; and
- Directing graduate and undergraduate research programs.

In addition to the above, the following measures of teaching performance are expected of Extension educators:

- An understanding of the needs for knowledge by stakeholders;
- The ability to communicate effectively with outreach stakeholders;
- The ability to anticipate the needs of outreach stakeholders and respond with appropriate educational activities;
- The development and delivery of outreach education programs;
- Changed practices, policies or behavior from outreach education;
- The development of teaching materials; and
- Extension publications and juried presentations.

Student evaluations of individual courses are required for every regular (credit-based) classroom course taught. University-supplied SEI evaluation forms will be used for all classes, although more specialized evaluation forms can be used to supplement university forms and is recommended. The SEI evaluations will normally be done through the University's online system. The TE/Mentoring Committee of the candidate (see [POA](#) Section VII.C.5 &6) will determine procedures for the distribution and collection of evaluation forms, and the compilation and comparison of results. Evaluation forms will be distributed by someone identified by the

TE/Mentoring Committee (not the candidate) and will be returned to the TE/Mentoring Committee. The summary SEI report from the University should be given directly to the TE/Mentoring Committee. Because extension (outreach) teaching is done in situations that are much more variable than classroom teaching, evaluation of extension (outreach) presentations will be done using the Evaluation of Effective Extension Teaching (EEET) instrument provided by OSUE where this is deemed appropriate by the TE/Mentoring Committee. Where use of the EEET is deemed inappropriate, other approaches may be used as approved by the TE/Mentoring Committee.

For faculty members with substantial classroom teaching responsibilities, additional means of student evaluation are appropriate, as decided by the TE/Mentoring Committee. These may include exit interviews of undergraduate advisees and surveys of former students. Letters of evaluation from former graduate students may also be appropriate in many cases. The TE/Mentoring Committee will select the students to provide the evaluations. The TE/Mentoring Committee takes responsibility for the oversight of the peer review of teaching. In this capacity, the TE/mentoring committee may ask other faculty to observe the classroom and/or extension presentations, depending on the area of specialization of the candidate, and give a report to the TE committee, or members of the TE/Mentoring Committee may do this directly. Peer evaluation of classroom teaching should include TE/Mentoring Committee review of course materials, including syllabi, exams, and instructional material, as well as observations of classroom teaching. Course material may be sent to faculty at other universities in the same specialty for appraisal. These evaluations will be done as part of an organized plan, determined in the periodic meetings of the committee with the candidate, rather than by haphazard appearance of evaluators at lectures. Representative lectures from all courses will be observed. Peer evaluation of extension (outreach) teaching includes committee review of extension publications (e.g., Newsletters, Fact Sheets, Bulletins, Electronic Media products, etc.), computer programs, teaching material (e.g., slides, overheads, electronic and computer demonstrations), and observations of extension presentations. Peer evaluations of teaching materials may also be solicited from extension faculty in other departments or universities, if appropriate. Surveys of county agents or district specialists in OSUE, using evaluation instruments developed by OSUE, may provide information relevant for peer evaluation; however, county agents and district specialists can also be considered stakeholders of the candidate in that instructional material is often aimed at these individuals, thus, flexibility must be considered in evaluation of extension teaching.

Other forms of teaching evaluation used by the TE/Mentoring Committee may include: assessment of the success of the candidate's former graduate students and post-docs; the extent to which teaching materials developed by the candidate have been adopted by faculty at other institutions; the extent to which the candidate is

invited to provide expertise on teaching; the extent to which the candidate is requested to give invited lectures (including extension presentations) in other departments, or other universities, or states; membership on national teaching committees; and teaching awards.

Each TE/Mentoring Committee will provide a written report annually to the P&T Committee during their deliberations each May or June. This is required every year, even if the candidate did not engage in any direct classroom or extension education efforts during that year. Such letters should address all teaching activities of the candidate since the last letter was written to the P&T Committee. Assessments should be made wherever appropriate on any or all of the measures of teaching effectiveness listed above. These are outlined in the APT document of the College and in the CFAES Faculty Reward System Guidelines.

Copies of each TE letter will be distributed to all current members of the P&T committee for their use during the annual review process. Each TE/Mentoring Committee will give a copy of the TE letter to the candidate for whom the letter was written to provide annual feedback on evaluation of their teaching effectiveness. The TE/Mentoring Committee should schedule a time to meet with the candidate to discuss points in the letter if either the committee members or the candidate wishes to do so. When a case comes to the eligible faculty for P&T consideration, all TE letters will be made available to all eligible faculty. At that time, a series of TE letters will exist and progress in teaching effectiveness can be seen.

- **Research**

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

Excellence in research is indicated by validation of the candidate's original discovery work by their peers. For most faculty members in the Department, the primary demonstration of research excellence is publication of results of scholarly activity in peer-reviewed scientific journals, books, and invited presentations at professional meetings or seminars. For some faculty members, other research output may be as important as journal articles. Examples include patents and the development of products or processes used by University clientele (e.g., plant cultivars and disease resistant germplasm, new disease management programs) or the development of peer-reviewed extension or pedagogical publications. Less traditional forms of

research excellence may include computer-assisted learning material or computer software that has been judged to be of high quality and has been adopted by others, or the development of products which break new intellectual ground and enjoy substantial adoption, or new efforts in distance education which are used by peer institutions or peer-validated by some other means. In all cases, documentation of the quality of research contributions and impact of the work as validated by peers is essential.

An essential part of the dossier of a candidate is a listing of the publications and other research works and the description of the contribution of the candidate to each item. Significance of the contributions is the key factor in the evaluations, not simply the order of authors in multi-authored publications. The quality and appropriateness of the publication outlets (e.g., refereed journals) will be evaluated in the review. Flexibility must be given here in the evaluation because one peer-reviewed venue might be the most appropriate outlet for a given candidate based on the type of research work being conducted, whereas another may be more appropriate for a different candidate. There is no single metric characterizing the impact or significance of a journal or article within a journal. Quality, significance, focus, scholarly contribution to field, and depth of individual research publications or other outputs and the overall program, within the context of the candidate's appointment, will be evaluated internally (through the deliberations of the P&T Committee and discussions with departmental faculty) and externally through letters of evaluation. Both the quantity and quality of research are important to document, as is the pattern of production of these efforts within the context of the candidate's appointment during the probationary period or period since the last promotion.

Obtaining external funds for conducting research is an important measurable component of a high-quality research program. Although obtaining funding from highly competitive, peer-reviewed granting programs is one measure of quality of a candidate's achievements, lack of funding from certain granting programs is not necessarily an indication of poor quality. That is, external funds are not obtained simply to demonstrate significance of the research, but to provide a means so that research can be done. All faculty have an obligation to obtain the necessary funding to support their research, but the source of the funding should be appropriate for their appointment and nature of their studies.

Other measures that indicate the quality of a research program include but are not limited to: invitations to speak at national and international scientific conferences, to give seminars or workshops at other universities, and to write book chapters or to edit books on areas of expertise; prestigious awards received; and membership and activity on regional or national and international research (or policy) related committees. Serving as an Associate or Senior Editor of scientific journals and serving on review panels for national or regional competitive grants programs are

further recognition of a faculty members expertise, even though these can also be considered service functions.

- **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 non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

All eligible faculty members are expected to contribute actively to the operation and functioning of the Department, the College, and the University. Documentation of service should include a listing and description of the candidate's contributions to the general activities of the Department, College, University, and profession. This includes, but is not limited to, active service on committees of the Department, College, or University, participation in Departmental faculty meetings, serving in supportive administrative roles, representing the University in service to the non-academic community, and serving in special roles such as with commodity groups, community development groups, youth support groups, etc. Documentation of quality or impact of the service is required. Examples include but are not limited to, leadership of certain activities, demonstrated by chairing committees, as well as organizing national or international professional programs. Serving the profession by invitation or election, particularly as an officer or editor, at the state, regional, national, or international level are clear indicators of the quality of service.

As indicated previously in this document, citizenship within the Department is a critical component of service and must be documented. High quality service and good citizenship require that the candidate works in a positive manner for the improvement of the Department and the services provided. Documentation of citizenship is obtained from the discussions with each faculty member during the annual evaluation of candidates.

Although service within the University can be evaluated by members of the Department, external evaluators may provide useful appraisal of service at the national or international level as well as academic societies.

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

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

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

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

- **External Evaluations** (see also [External Evaluations below](#))

As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to departmental guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for non-probationary professional

practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself. If the Chair disagrees with the P&T recommendation, a vote of the eligible faculty will be taken to decide if a full non-mandatory review will proceed.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

Late Spring: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).

- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
- **Early Autumn:** Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record. During this stage of the review, a report from the candidate's Teaching Evaluation (TE) committee or Mentoring committee (see [POA](#) Section VII.C.5 &6) is made available to the P&T committee. The candidate's annual performance review letters and annual promotion and tenure review letters from the previous three years are made available to the P&T committee.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty

perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- **Early Autumn Semester:** The candidate's Mentoring Committee will review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process.

c. Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

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

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

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the

candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the departmental review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the chair is final

in such cases.

- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

3. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for professional practice or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a professional practice or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of 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 is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see

description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations only from professors at institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. Evaluations from current or past students or from other clientele (e.g., growers, county agents, industry professionals) also may be solicited, as appropriate. Justification will be provided in each such case.

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by 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 does 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](#).

Evaluators may be asked to review different aspects of the candidate's dossier, depending on the appointment of the individual and qualifications of the evaluator. For example, if a candidate has appointments in OARDC and OSUE, different individuals may be asked to evaluate contributions in research and extension teaching. Evaluators will be given the most up-to-date draft of the candidate's dossier and related documentation, such as reprints of journal articles or descriptions of teaching effectiveness.

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

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

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

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

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

VIII. Seventh Year Reviews

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

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this Department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if they are going to provide in-class time for students to

complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department Chair oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually, the Department Chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the Department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and professional practice faculty at least once per year during each year of service before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary professional practice assistant and associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six-year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professional practice professors at least once every other year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.
- To review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted

at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department Chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

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

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