Administrative Memorandum 3 & 3a
Revised November 19, 2010

**College of Forestry
College-level Promotion and Tenure Committee and
Promotion and Tenure Dossier Guidelines**

I. College-level Promotion and Tenure Committee

PURPOSE
The OSU Faculty Handbook Procedural Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure require each College to maintain a College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The purpose of the College of Forestry P&T Committee is twofold:

(a) The primary role of the College P&T committee is to provide an independent evaluation of dossiers. This evaluation is intended to supplement the evaluations conducted by the Department or Unit Level P&T Committee and the Department Head. According to the Faculty Handbook, the College P&T Committee review should ensure that each dossier has been carefully and properly prepared, and that uniform or equivalent standards are applied to all candidates within the College. The reviewers at the college level are to determine whether the departmental-level letters of evaluation fairly assess the merits of the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier. The intent of the Faculty Handbook Guidelines was clarified by the Faculty Senate President and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in a memo to faculty dated 10/27/10. The memo stated that "the expectation is that the College level committee will review the candidate's dossier, make an independent evaluation and recommend for or against promotion and/or tenure."

(b) A secondary, but valuable, role of the Committee is to determine what changes, if any, in the dossier could strengthen or clarify the presentation of the candidate's accomplishments.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE
• Two faculty members elected from each department and one member elected from off-campus Extension Forestry faculty.
• Tenured, associate or full professors with at least 0.5 FTE in the College are eligible for election.
• College administrators (dean, assistant and associate deans, department heads) are not eligible to serve.

ELECTIONS
• In spring term, the Dean's Office will notify those departments and Extension Forestry whose committee representative's term will expire in the coming July to initiate the process to elect a successor.
• Any faculty member in a position that has a tenure and/or a promotion track appointment (i.e., instructors, faculty research assistants, and professorial rank faculty),

on at least a 9-month contract, and with at least 0.5 FTE in the College are eligible to vote in their respective department or off-campus Extension Forestry elections.
• Off-campus Extension Forestry faculty will elect a representative eligible to serve on the Committee.
• Once the department and off-campus Extension Forestry elections are completed, the continuing and incoming committee members shall elect the chairperson for the next academic year.
• Faculty members are eligible to be elected to successive terms.
• When a vacancy occurs on the committee, an election shall be held to select a representative to complete the term. The election shall be conducted at the Department or off-campus Extension Forestry level in accordance with the seat that is vacated.

TERM
Each member serves a 3 year-term that begins on July 1. The terms of the first committee members shall be staggered, by lot such that 1/3 of the committee membership (2 or 3) expires each year.

REVIEW
Before the end of each academic year, the committee shall review the functions, procedures and composition of the College of Forestry Promotion and Tenure Committee and forward to the Forestry Executive Committee any recommendations for change.

PROCESS
1. Departments initiate documentation and evaluation of materials through their respective committee process, including preparation of a faculty committee evaluation and recommendation letter, and candidate rebuttal if appropriate. The letter of evaluation prepared by the department committee must contain a statement that describes the process used to constitute the committee.

2. The Department Head prepares an independent letter of evaluation and recommendation. The completed and signed dossiers, in the form that they would be submitted to the Provost, are forwarded to College P&T Committee.

3. The College P&T Committee independently evaluates the dossier – including all letters of evaluation and recommendation from the Department Head, the departmental committee, external reviewers, and the student or client representatives; together with any candidate's response to non-confidential evaluations to which they have access.

The outcome of the College P&T Committee evaluation, including the recommendation for or against the proposed promotion and/or tenure action and a vote tally, is conveyed through a letter to the Dean. The letter should reference this administrative memo to document the process used to constitute the committee. College P&T Committee members who have signed department level letters of evaluation shall recuse themselves from votes on these cases.

NOTE: If, in the process of reviewing the dossier, the College Committee identifies concerns with the department-level statements, including if they believe that significant points for or against the candidate have been missed, the Committee writes an internal memo to the Department Head detailing concerns and sends a copy to the Dean as a record of the Committee's concerns and for purposes of

transparency in the review process. This memo will not be retained in the dossier. The Committee also includes in the internal memo to the Department Head any suggested changes that could strengthen or clarify the presentation of the candidate's accomplishments in the dossier.

The Department Head or departmental committee responds by modifying the dossier or by rebutting College P&T Committee comments in writing. The College Committee considers any revisions in the dossier and departmental response as they complete their evaluation.

4. The Dean conducts an executive review with Department Head and candidate, utilizing all letters as the basis for recommendation to the Provost.

II. College Supplemental Guidelines for Preparing the P&T Dossier

Background and Purpose

The **University guidelines** provide the basic direction on the content and format for P&T dossiers and should include these sections in this order:

I. COVER PAGE

II. FORM A

III. CONFIDENTIALITY WAIVER (signed waiver or statement that waiver was not signed)

IV. POSITION DESCRIPTION

V. CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT

VI. STUDENT LETTER OF EVALUATION (as appropriate)

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE LETTERS OF EVALUATION

VIII. PROMOTION AND TENURE VITAE

IX. LETTERS OF EVALUATION

X. OTHER LETTERS AND MATERIALS (optional)

XI. CANDIDATE'S SIGNED STATEMENT

The specific content of each of these sections can be found at http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/dosguide.html

Supplemental Preparation Guidelines

The following **College guidelines** are supplemental to the University Guidelines and are intended to improve the utility of the dossiers to reviewers at all levels.

1. Complete Dossier: The dossier presented to the College P&T Committee should be a final version with all mandated forms and components as specified in the University P&T preparation guidelines except for the College Committee Letter and the Dean's evaluation. All forms, especially Form A, should be completely filled out and signed. Form A will not have the Dean's signature at this point.

2. <u>Electronic Copies:</u> The dossier must be submitted to the Dean's office in electronic form to facilitate the review process. Use of the .pdf format at this final stage is encouraged. Assembly of the dossier at the department level should use the word processing software preferred by the office staff responsible for assembly of the document.

3. The <u>Department Faculty Evaluation</u> must be signed by all members of the Committee. Electronic signatures are acceptable.

4. <u>Job descriptions:</u>   The candidate's current position description is required. If there have been <u>significant</u> changes to the position description these must be briefly described with a table summarizing FTE distribution among primary activities over time.   When significant changes have occurred, earlier position descriptions should be included. If significant changes in the PD have not occurred then this should be stated. Statements about position description are to be either included on the position description page separator or on a separate page placed ahead of the current PD,

5. <u>Period of Record</u>: The dossier should be a career document for all ranks and not just include information from the previous evaluation. Accomplishments made at other institutions must be clearly distinguished from those at OSU. For example, the list of refereed journal articles should be subdivided into sections associated with work at OSU and elsewhere.

6. <u>SET Scores:</u> Use the matrix format illustrated below for reporting SET scores for individual instructors.
   - Report results only for Question 2 on SET form
   - Retain the "COF 5-YR AVE" line as a comparator for the instructor's scores. To find the current average, see <u>T:\COF\Reports\SET Reports\</u> and the appropriate SET 5-year Avg…doc file. Note that the average is different for graduate and undergraduate courses.
   - The instructor's scores by term and course fall beneath the "COF 5-YR AVE."
     - Results should be grouped by specific classes, and then arranged chronologically. (e.g. all the FE xxx together, followed by the FE zzz)
     - Replace a,b,c, etc.. with actual numerical values for instructor (see SET form)
     - In final column use # responses (from the SET report form)/# students enrolled at end of term (from Banner or class rosters). If the latter proves too difficult for past terms, just list the # of responses.

UNDERGRADUATE COURSES TAUGHT (EXAMPLE):

Question 2: The instructor's contribution to the course was:

	Unable To Rate % (#)	Very Poor % (#)	Poor % (#)	Fair % (#)	Good % (#)	Very Good % (#)	Excel. % (#)	Median	# Responses
COF 5-YR AVG. (03-08)	1%	0%	3%	7%	24%	33%	33%	5.0	**9089**
Instructor Term/Year Course									
S04 FE 3xx	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	5.8	8/10
W05 FE 3xx	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	4.5	28/32
W06 FE 4yz	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	5.2	20/24
W07 FE 4yz	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	4.1	19/25
W08 FE 4yz	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	4.6	26/32
SP08 FE 2zz	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	5.2	84/100

GRADUATE COURSES TAUGHT (EXAMPLE):

Question 2: The instructor's contribution to the course was:

	Unable To Rate % (#)	Very Poor % (#)	Poor % (#)	Fair % (#)	Good % (#)	Very Good % (#)	Excel. % (#)	Median	# Responses
COF 5-YR AVG. (03-08)	1%	0%	3%	7%	24%	33%	33%	5.3	**9089**
Instructor Term/Year Course									
F04 FE 5xx	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	5.9	8/8
F05 FE 5xx	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	5.5	6/10
F06 FE 5xx	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	5.2	9/13
F07 FE 6yz	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	4.8	4/13
F08 FOR abc	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	4.6	26/39

7. <u>Reporting of Publications:</u>

    a. Refereed publications refer to journal or other articles in which the authors submit a manuscript to an editor who conducts a peer review (blind or not). The editor has full prerogative to accept or reject the submitted article. Peer-reviewed articles are those that are subject to review by others for the purpose of improving accuracy, quality, applicability, etc. Editors will only rarely reject these submissions.

    b. In Review Publications: A candidate may include citations of refereed articles that have been submitted but not yet accepted, The full citation must be included with the notation "(in review, mss submitted xx/xx/xx)", where xx =

date of submission. If a publication has not been submitted to a publisher then it must not be included.

    c. Numbering: All publications within a category (such as refereed, peer-reviewed, books and book chapters, trade and popular articles, reports, etc.) will be numbered from oldest to newest, in reverse order. That is, the newest publication, including those in review, shall be at the top of the list and carry the largest number. The numbering should be restarted in each publication category.

    d. Authorship: Citations will include all authors in the order as published. Names of candidates will not be put in bold, underlined or otherwise distinguished. Clarification of the candidate's role in joint efforts must be provided in the dossier. This can be done individually for each publication as in the example below or by other suitable means, as long as the candidate's role in each publication is clear.

    Smythe, Mary and Emil Phunorkin. 2007. Consequences of failed land management experiments on small mammals. Journal of Irreproducible Results 35(21-32). [Paper written on Smythe's MS thesis for which I served as major advisor and PI on the grant that supported her]

8. <u>Journal Descriptions:</u> The university guidelines mandate some description of the "…stature of the sources…" in which a candidate's scholarship appears. For CoF faculty this should appear in a paragraph at the beginning of the section on refereed journal citations, or separately for any other type of scholarship. This should describe in whatever terms are most descriptive to lay readers why you chose to use specific outlets for your scholarship and something about the nature of the publications and principal audiences. All journals in your list need to be referred to, either by describing them individually, or by grouping their descriptions in some manner. A similar accounting should be included for other types of scholarship. The University definition of scholarship must be carefully consulted.

9. <u>Citations of Presentations</u> are to be presented in two separate groups: invited and volunteered. The authors of the presentations are to be in the order as advertised in conference/program literature, abstracts or proceedings. An asterisk (*) shall be attached to end of the name of the person making the presentation. The name of the candidate will not be put in bold, underlined or otherwise distinguished. A foot note to the section will explain that the asterisk marks the presenter. A full citation for the presentation must be included. At the end of the citation the type of presentation (oral or poster) should be identified.

10. <u>Grant Reporting</u>

    a. Funded Grants: A full citation will include all PI's in the order they appear on grant application, year of initial grant award, title of grant, duration of grant, funding source, total amount received and amount attributed to the work of the candidate. All grants, competitive or non-competitive will be included. The competitive nature of all grants should be described. This can be done for each grant individually or by grouping them in some fashion, as appropriate.

b. Pending or Denied Grant or Contract Proposals: Pending proposals may be included at the discretion of the candidate. Denied proposals may be included if necessary to show effort—consultation with the Department Head is imperative.