



**Administrative Memo #3** (formerly 3,3a,4)  
**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**  
Revised: August 2016

**Purpose:** This memo outlines the promotion and tenure process and expectations for the College. These guidelines supplement the [Faculty Handbook section on Promotion and Tenure](#) published by Academic Affairs and the Senate, which supersedes any discrepancies between the two documents. This memo is intended to assist faculty in understanding and meeting the criteria, assist reviewers in evaluation the documentation of faculty accomplishments, and establish rules for the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Part I:** [Faculty Promotion and Tenure](#)

- A. [General Expectations for College Faculty](#)
- B. [Position Description](#)
- C. [Criteria for Promotion, Tenure and Scholarship](#)
- D. [Performance Expectations and Evidence](#)
  - 1. [Granting of Indefinite Tenure](#)
  - 2. [Promotion](#)
    - a. [Instruction and Advising](#)
      - [For Promotion to Associate Professor](#)
      - [For Promotion to Professor](#)
    - b. [Research](#)
      - [For Promotion to Associate Professor](#)
      - [For Promotion to Professor](#)
    - c. [Extended Education](#)
      - [For Promotion to Associate Professor](#)
      - [For Promotion to Professor](#)
    - d. [Service](#)

**Part II:** [Preparation of the Dossier](#)

- [Required Sections](#)
- A. [Complete Dossier](#)
  - B. [Electronic Process](#)
  - C. [Department Faculty Evaluation](#)
  - D. [Position Description](#)
  - E. [Period of Record](#)
  - F. [Peer Teaching Evaluation](#)
  - G. [SET Scores](#)
  - H. [Reporting of Publications](#)
  - I. [Journal Descriptions](#)
  - J. [Citations of Presentations](#)
  - K. [Grant Reporting](#)

**Part III:** [Operations of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee](#)

- A. [Role of the Committee](#)
- B. [Composition of the Committee](#)
  - 1. [Term](#)
  - 2. [Elections](#)
  - 3. [Chair of the Committee](#)
  - 4. [Review of the Committee](#)
- C. [Process for Standard "In-cycle" P&T Reviews](#)
- D. [Process for "Out-of-cycle" P&T Review](#)

**Appendix A:** [Dossier – Example Table Format, Courses Taught](#)

**Appendix B:** [Dossier – Example Table Format, Grant Reporting](#)

## PART I: Faculty Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

### **A. General Expectations for College Faculty**

All professorial faculty in the College of Forestry, including those on either fixed term or tenure track appointments, are considered scholars and teachers and must be engaged in both scholarly and instructional activities relevant to their position. These guidelines include performance and scholarship expectations related to the University and College missions in instruction, research, extended education, and institutional service. It is reasonable to expect that the position description will change with concomitant faculty development; therefore, the specific expectations of faculty will change over time. However, to be successful, each faculty member will meet or exceed acceptable levels of productivity and quality in their job. Successful faculty should develop interpersonal and communications skills that facilitate their positive interaction with colleagues, co-workers, students and a diverse public audience.

Non-professorial faculty have special skills or experience needed for the instructional, research, extended education, and service programs in the College. Position descriptions for these faculty will reflect expected scholarly activity, and annual professional review will identify performance expectations.

And finally, Oregon State University is committed to maintaining and enhancing its collaborative and inclusive community that strives for equity and equal opportunity. All faculty members are responsible for helping to ensure that these goals are achieved.

### **B. Position Description**

Each faculty member will have a signed position description describing their major duties and responsibilities. This position description will include performance and scholarship expectations related to the University, College and Departmental missions in instruction, research, extended education and service. The position description will specifically identify the:

- major areas where focus and distinction are expected;
- type and nature of scholarly activity relevant to the position;
- expected contributions to institutional service and expectation to effectively document scholarship and program development.

The initial position description is developed from the position announcement for new faculty, and mutually affirmed by the faculty member and supervisor at the time of appointment. When the PROF review is conducted, the position description is used as a basis for evaluating a faculty member's progress and performance; the position description will be reviewed at this time to assess whether it should be modified/updated. As faculty develop professionally it is reasonable to expect that the position description will be modified accordingly and both supervisor and faculty signatures are required on any position description.

Additionally, stipulated contributions to equity, inclusion, and diversity should be clearly identified in the position description so that they can be evaluated in promotion and tenure decisions. Such contributions can be part of teaching, advising, research, extension, and/or service. They can be, but do not have to be, part of scholarly work. Outputs and impacts of these faculty members' efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity should be included in promotion and tenure dossiers.

### **C. Criteria for Promotion, Tenure and Scholarship**

The Faculty Senate have established criteria for promotion and tenure, as noted in the [Faculty Handbook](#). From the contemporary perspective of a land-grant university, and, in

particular that of the College of Forestry, scholarship is demonstrated in instruction, extended education, and research.

The definition of scholarship found in the Faculty Handbook is affirmed as the norm for the College of Forestry:

*All Oregon State University faculty in the professorial ranks have a responsibility to engage in scholarship and creative activity. Scholarship and creative activity are understood to be intellectual work whose significance is validated by peers and which is communicated. More specifically, such work in its diverse forms must be based on a high level of professional expertise; must give evidence of originality; must be documented and validated as through peer review or critique; and must be communicated in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself. Intellectual work in research, teaching, extension, service, or other assignments is scholarship if it is shared with peers in journals, in formal peer-reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer-evaluated forums.*

There are three key elements of scholarship common to all faculty assignments: scholarship should create something that is new or innovative; be acknowledged by appropriate peers; and be effectively communicated to appropriate audiences. For promotion and tenure, clear documentation of these three elements is required to demonstrate scholarly activity. If applicable, contributions to equity, inclusion, and diversity via scholarly activity should also be documented.

#### **D. Performance Expectations and Evidence**

The following sections identify general expectations for all fixed term and annual tenure professorial faculty seeking promotion or tenure. Faculty are evaluated in light of the general missions of the Department, College and University, and of their collegial citizenship, professional growth and service contributions. Not all faculty have equal levels of responsibility with each mission. Specific faculty activities are evaluated within the context of the position description and the criteria in this document. In general, faculty members are expected to be highly competent in all areas of responsibility. Beyond that foundation of competence, genuine excellence is expected in the major assignment area or areas.

Some professorial rank faculty may have special assignments with administration, research management, international activities or other duties that serve the College mission. These faculty are evaluated by standards that appropriately consider the unique characteristics of the position. Normally, these standards are specified in the position description.

##### **1. Granting of Indefinite Tenure**

Indefinite tenure is a linchpin of academic freedom. It also signals a long-term commitment to excellence and program development by both institution and faculty. To be granted indefinite tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate achievement and show potential for long term productivity and value to the University and College. Outputs and impacts of faculty members' efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity should also be considered when indefinite tenure is granted.

In measures commensurate with the position description, excellence is demonstrated in the following:

- Effectiveness as a teacher of appropriate subject material as recognized by appropriate peers. Demonstrated potential for growth and adaptability to

changing educational needs. Effectiveness may be shown by student or alumni evaluation using regular surveys, correspondence or informal interviews, or through quality and proficiency evaluation by appropriate peers.

- Active interest in and assistance to, students documented through regular surveys, correspondence, or informal interviews of students and recent alumni. Effective service as a formal or informal faculty advisor or graduate student mentor must be evident if appropriate to the position.
- Likelihood for continued research and educational accomplishments demonstrated by publication in disciplinary journals and periodicals, contributions to books, journals or conferences, the development of products such as models, computer software, patents and licenses, equipment, tools or techniques, and success in acquiring extramural funding.
- A potential to enhance knowledge by the ability to maintain a research or educational direction over time, or to address and integrate questions of scale or processes beyond a strict disciplinary or regional focus.
- A promise for continued accomplishment in instruction or extended education demonstrated by documented educational program development and outcomes, development of educational processes, tools and methods, and contributions to educational courses, conferences, workshops and seminars.
- A potential for increased professional growth and improved instruction or extended education program quality as shown by courses, programs or curricula that adapt over time to changing issues in the faculty member's area of expertise.

## **2. Promotion**

Promotion of professorial faculty in the College of Forestry is based on merit and recognizes effective contributions of faculty to the institutional missions. Promotion decisions are never based on time in rank. Some criteria for promotion are described below for each of the distinct elements that may be present in the faculty job description. Promotion, however, is based upon the aggregate record of a faculty member in all professional activities.

### **a. Instruction and Advising**

Instruction and advising are central to the mission of the College of Forestry and the University. Excellent teachers develop educational materials and contribute to curricula that are relevant and timely with respect to the profession. Course presentation must stimulate learning and effectively convey knowledge to students. Faculty have an important role in recruiting, advising, and mentoring students. It is a faculty obligation to objectively evaluate the knowledge gained by students so that they are prepared to meet the future challenges of society. If applicable, outputs and impacts of faculty members' efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity in instruction and advising should be documented.

#### For Promotion to Associate Professor:

Faculty with instruction and advising responsibilities will normally have met the requirements for granting of indefinite tenure (if tenure-track) and will demonstrate continued growth and development as a teacher and advisor.

Example evidence includes:

- The development and use of original teaching aids, materials, approaches and techniques in courses.
- Active participation in a continuing process of curriculum and individual course assessment, revision, and development.

- Self-improvement in the approaches and techniques of instruction, command of subject matter and other curricular issues.
- Active involvement in student recruitment, advising, and retention activities that expand and enhance the student learning opportunities and environment.
- Mentoring or advising graduate students to become effective professionals with critical thinking and communications skills; helping students develop writing abilities through joint publications or similar activities.

For Promotion to Professor:

Faculty must have a consistent record of effective teaching, advising, and teaching service. Examples of demonstrating this are:

- Quality evaluation by students or alumni through regular surveys, correspondence, or informal interviews; and quality evaluation by appropriate peers.
- Significantly influencing the curriculum through major revision of existing courses, developing new courses, and minors or programs.
- Continued active involvement in undergraduate student advising, recruitment and retention activities that ensure delivery of effective support and timely information for students and training and assistance for new advisors.
- The development, use and dissemination of original course materials and teaching methods that may be adopted by other faculty or institutions.
- A leadership role in curriculum assessment, revision, and development, service on college or university curriculum committees, and service to regional or national accreditation bodies in curricular accreditation.
- Continued mentoring or guiding graduate students, especially at the doctoral level, with evidence of joint publications or presentations as well as career placement of advisees.
- A greater teaching role shown by a wide array of courses taught either within or beyond the department, and by guiding graduate students in other disciplines.

**b. Research**

Excellence in research is demonstrated by scholarly activities and outcomes commensurate with assigned research responsibilities and with a high level of productivity and quality. Scholarly research is expected to: a) discover new knowledge or develop new technologies, materials or methods; b) be acknowledged by appropriate peers; and c) be effectively communicated to appropriate audiences. Successful researchers identify and prioritize research issues, are able practitioners of scientific methods with appropriate research tools, are skillful gatherers and managers of research assets, and are effective communicators of research findings. If applicable, outputs and impacts of faculty members' efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity in research should be documented.

For Promotion to Associate Professor:

Faculty will normally have met the requirements for granting of indefinite tenure (if tenure-track) and should have developed innovative or new research opportunities. Example expectations are:

- A demonstrated ability to design, implement, complete, and report research results in a timely manner. Evidence of meeting this expectation includes scholarly publications, contributions to workshops and conferences, success with obtaining extramural funding, and the development of products such as

models, computer software, patents, licenses, equipment, techniques or tools.

- Achievement of recognition for research accomplishments. This can be demonstrated by the acquisition of additional resources for program development, invited contributions to programs, awards, public acknowledgment of program excellence, and letters of positive evaluation from other scientists and researchers.
- Be seen as a distinct and significant contributor to their discipline or research field. This may be shown by appropriate peer review, by a clear explanation and justification of the research emphasis and by documenting focus in the research program. Contributors to team or interdisciplinary research programs should identify their individual contributions and those resulting from their integrative role.

For Promotion to Professor:

Faculty will have evidence of continued research productivity and quality, and a clear sign of growth and maturity in research achievements. Examples of success include:

- Broad, contemplative or integrated research activities as demonstrated by publishing in disciplinary or other scholarly journals and periodicals, invited contributions, multi-authored contributions or papers, and by securing significant extramural funding.
- Communications through scholarly syntheses about interpretations and implications of research including publications of scholarly works that integrate, summarize or interpret research and through presentation of such work at conferences or workshops. Evidence may also include acknowledgment by others of the importance, significance or relevance of research or of its implementation by users.
- An acknowledged stature and leadership role in the discipline, profession or geographic sphere. Evidence of stature includes a regional, national or international reputation for research achievements beyond the normal geographic sphere. Leadership roles in professional or scientific societies, journal or book editorship, selection to serve on competitive review or development panels, or awards for research accomplishments are also important types of evidence.
- The promotion or facilitation of research opportunities for others in the Department, College or University. This can be demonstrated by making significant contributions as a member of a productive disciplinary or interdisciplinary research group that has produced publications or products. Successful administration of a disciplinary or interdisciplinary research group may also demonstrate fulfillment of this expectation.

**c. Extended Education**

All faculty who have formal or informal responsibilities in extended education will demonstrate levels of activity commensurate with their appointment.

Outstanding practitioners of extended education identify and prioritize issues, develop, deliver and evaluate the impacts of programs. They work closely with clientele, interpret and integrate research into program content, and relate further research needs to appropriate faculty.

Excellence in extended education is evidenced by scholarly activities and outcomes. In this respect, extended educational work will: 1) create something original, often through integration and application of information or knowledge; 2) be acknowledged by appropriate peers; and 3) be effectively shared with

appropriate audiences. To be successful, the information provided in extended education programs must be contemporary, accurate, balanced and objective. If applicable, outputs and impacts of faculty members' efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity in extended education should be documented.

For Promotion to Associate Professor:

Faculty with extended education responsibilities will normally have met the requirements for granting of indefinite tenure (if tenure track) and should have developed innovative or new extended educational programs. Examples of evidence include:

- A demonstrated ability to design, implement and evaluate effective educational strategies. Evidence in meeting this expectation includes use of educational principles in program design, development and use of original teaching aids, materials and techniques in programs, selection of appropriate educational methods, production of peer reviewed educational products, and documented changes in client knowledge, skills and behavior leading to problem solution, education of the public, or creation of new opportunities.
- Programs that enhance the understanding and application of principles of informal education to extended education practitioners. A satisfactory review by appropriate peers is critical evidence of meeting this expectation.
- Recognized achievements for extended education accomplishments. This can be shown through the acquisition of additional resources for program development, invited contributions to programs, awards, public acknowledgment of program excellence, and surveys or letters of positive evaluation from clientele or others who have been influenced by these programs.

For Promotion to Professor:

Faculty should demonstrate continued productivity and a clear sign of growth and evolution in extended education achievements. Examples of demonstrating this are:

- A broad and integrative application of knowledge demonstrated by the involvement of other disciplines in program design, implementation and evaluation and by securing significant extramural resources over a broad spectrum of support.
- Innovations in program design adopted by other educators. This is evidenced by widespread use of materials and methods, including citation and adaptation by others, and by invited contributions to significant educational programs.
- The promotion or facilitation of extended education opportunities for others in the department, college or university. Evidence of this includes interdisciplinary involvement in programs and contributions toward program leadership and administration.
- An acknowledged stature in extended education, the discipline, the profession or geographic sphere of assignment. Recognition of such stature includes an acknowledged reputation outside of the geographic assignment area, positive evaluation by outside reviewers, leadership roles in professional societies, membership and service that acknowledges the person's expertise and awards for extended education accomplishments and/or leadership.

**d. Service**

Faculty in the College of Forestry are expected to be collegial citizens and

professionally support the quality and growth of Departmental, College, University and outreach education programs. Service and citizenship contributions to professional organizations and consultation to community, industry, government agencies, and non-governmental organizations are also expected. Professional service relevant to a faculty member's assignment that contributes to the University missions, and results in professional growth of the individual, team or unit is especially valued. Significant professional service contributions can strengthen a case for promotion or tenure. Service is expected at all professorial ranks at a level commensurate with maturity and experience. If applicable, outputs and impacts of faculty members' efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity should be documented.

Examples include:

- Leadership or participation in Departmental, College, University and local extended education committees (ad hoc or standing), faculty governance, and mentoring other faculty and staff.
- Leading, administering or managing common facilities, interdisciplinary teams, centers, or programs.
- Active participation in disciplinary or other professional associations and societies at a regional, national or international level.
- Service to community, state, federal or citizens organizations, panels or committees that draw upon the faculty member's expertise.
- Peer review of proposals, manuscripts, and editorships.
- Expert witness or testimony services.

## PART II: Preparation of the Dossier

The University guidelines provide basic direction on the content and format of dossiers. Dossiers must include these sections, in this order, with cover page for each section:

- I. DOSSIER COVER PAGE
- II. FORM A
- III. CONFIDENTIALITY 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/AWARDS (optional)
- XI. CANDIDATE'S SIGNED STATEMENT

Information on the specific content required for each section can be found in the [Faculty Handbook](#).

### College of Forestry Supplemental Preparation Guidelines

In addition to the University requirements, the following College supplemental guidelines are intended to improve the utility of the dossiers to reviewers at all levels.

#### A. **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. The Cover Page should conform to University guidelines (name, department, college, promotion to \_\_\_\_, year). All included forms, especially Form A, should be completely filled out and signed. Only those boxes should be checked where there is content in the dossier. Form A will not have Dean or Department Head signatures until completion of all the letters at the end of the College process. A Table of Contents and section cover pages must be inserted and labeled according to the sections noted on Form A.

#### B. **Electronic Process**

The process is entirely electronic. All sections of the dossiers are to be uploaded to the OSU Nolij information system for the review process. Hard copies do not need to be submitted. Instructions on how to upload dossiers have been shared with the appointed department level contacts. **Do not add your own pagination to documents or the table of contents.** The electronic system will add page numbers to the dossier. **Do not add your own pagination.**

#### C. The **Department Faculty Evaluation** must be signed by all members of the Committee. Electronic signatures are acceptable.

#### D. **Position Description**

The candidate's current signed position description is required. If there have been significant 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. All candidates must have a PD.

## E. Period of Record

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.

## F. Peer Teaching Evaluation

A letter from the candidate's peer teaching evaluation committee should be included in the dossier and be based on all peer teaching reviews over the evaluation timeframe. The items to be evaluated are listed in the P&T guidelines in the [OSU Faculty Handbook](#) (section VIII.B.3).

## G. SET Scores

Use the matrix format illustrated in Appendix A 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 T:\COF\Reports\SET Reports\ 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)
  - Insert your SET scores by course for instructor (see SET form).

## H. Reporting of Publications

1. **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.

### 2. 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 cannot be included.

### 3. 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.

### 4. 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]

## I. **Journal Descriptions**

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.

## J. **Citations of Presentations**

These 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.

## K. **Grant Reporting**

In addition to a listing of grants, a summary of grant activity and success will be prepared. See Appendix B for example table format.

### 1. **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.

For grants where the faculty acts as an administrator more than as a typical PI, that role should be noted and funding total attributed appropriately. For example, a lead PI on a large grant of \$500,000 is allocated \$100,000 for her/his portion and the rest is allocated to a group of other PI's on the grant: the faculty should note their role and their portion ('My Share' on the example summary table). The role of administrator may require significant leadership and this should be considered when preparing the description and in evaluating effort.

### 2. **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 but must document the level of competitiveness (e.g., proportion funded) and the rating—consultation with the Department Head is imperative.

## PART III: Operations of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The OSU [Faculty Handbook](#) on procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure requires each College to maintain a College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and also describes the role and responsibilities of the College and Department P&T Committees (see section “Tenure Unit Review and Recommendation Policy, approved by President Ray on July 7, 2010).

### **A. Role of the Committee**

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. 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.”

Additionally, the College Committee is responsible for:

- Reviewing the dossiers and recommend changes, if any, that could strengthen or clarify the presentation of the candidate’s accomplishments.
- Providing independent evaluations of candidates selected for CoF senior faculty and administrator positions that include awarding of indefinite tenure and/or appointment at the rank of Professor. These evaluations are likely to occur outside of the normal annual schedule for reviewing dossiers.
  - The exception is for the position of dean where the determination is made by the Provost.
- Periodic review of the college-level promotion and tenure process and recommendation of clarifications and improvements to the Forestry Executive Committee (FEC).

### **B. Composition of the Committee**

The committee consists of two faculty elected from each department and one member elected from the Extension forestry faculty. Members must be tenured, associate or full professors with at least 0.5 FTE in the College to be eligible for election. College administrators (e.g. dean, assistant and associate deans, department heads) are not eligible to serve.

#### **1. Term**

Each member is appointed to a 3 year term that begins on July 1. The terms of the committee members shall be staggered so that 1/3 of the membership expires each year. Members are eligible to serve successive terms (per election by their department). For those members appointed to replace another member mid-term, they will be appointed for the term the original member was to serve; replacement members must be elected by their unit.

#### **2. Elections**

During the spring term, the Dean’s Office will notify those units whose representative’s term will expire to initiate the process to elect a successor. Any faculty member with tenure and/or a promotion track appointment (e.g. 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 unit elections.

3. Chair of the Committee  
On July 1, the continuing and incoming committee members shall elect the chairperson for the next academic year.
4. Review of the Committee  
Before the end of the academic year, the committee shall review the functions, procedures and composition of the committee and forward to the Forestry Executive Committee any recommendations for change.

### C. Process for Standard “In-cycle” P&T Reviews

Departments initiate documentation and evaluation of materials through their respective committee process, including preparation of a faculty committee evaluation and recommendation letter, as well as a candidate rebuttal, if appropriate.

1. The letter of evaluation prepared by the **Departmental P&T Committee** must contain a statement that describes the process used to constitute the committee. While a general evaluation of the case should be included in the letter, this should be supported by specific statements that address whether University [individual criteria for promotion and tenure](#) have been met (found in the OSU Faculty Handbook on Promotion and Tenure). The letter should conclude with a statement indicating the total number of faculty voting on a case, the number of yes versus no votes, the number of abstaining faculty, and whether there were conflicts of interest and if there were how they were resolved.
2. The **Department Head** prepares an independent letter of evaluation and recommendation. The Department Head should include an explanation of any issues or exceptional circumstances that influence the interpretation of the case (e.g., undocumented but agreed upon changes in the position description, timing or completeness of peer teaching materials). 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.
4. The **College P&T Committee** prepares a letter to the Dean conveying the outcome of their evaluation, including a recommendation for or against the proposed promotion and/or tenure action and a vote tally. 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. The letter should conclude with a statement indicating the total number of faculty voting on a case, the number of yes versus no votes, the number of abstaining faculty, and whether there were conflicts of interest and if there were how they were resolved.

**NOTE:** If, in the process of reviewing the dossier, the College P&T 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 the concerns and includes suggested changes that could strengthen or clarify the presentation of the candidate’s accomplishments in the dossier. The Dean is copied on this memo 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.

5. **The Department Head** or departmental committee responds by modifying and resubmitting the dossier or by rebutting College P&T Committee comments in writing. The College P&T Committee considers any revisions in the dossier and departmental response as they complete their evaluation.
6. **The Dean** conducts an executive review with Department Head and candidate, utilizing all letters as the basis for recommendation to the Provost. The Dean copies the Candidate and the Department Head in his/her communication to the Provost.
7. **The Provost** makes the final decision.

#### D. Process for “Out-of-cycle” Reviews

These are reviews associated with searches for senior faculty and administrator positions that include awarding of indefinite tenure and/or appointment at the rank of Professor. Regarding the process and dossier, Academic Affairs has [established two processes](#) for hiring an academic faculty member with tenure: the first is for faculty who do not have tenure at their current institution, and the second is for faculty who do hold tenure at their current institution. The differences for each case are noted below.

1. The **Chair of the College P&T Committee** will assign a member(s) to be embedded with the Search and Screening Committee, at a minimum during the finalist selection process. The member(s) will represent the College P&T Committee in a review and evaluation of the application materials submitted by each finalist against the university standards for awarding of indefinite tenure and promotion to the rank of Professor. Typically, the Committee member(s) assigned will be the one(s) most familiar with the discipline of the finalists.

If the judgment of the Committee member(s) is that a finalist’s record of accomplishment might not be sufficient to warrant awarding of indefinite tenure or the rank of Professor, the full College P&T Committee will be convened. If the Committee finds sufficient cause for concern, the Committee Chair shall write a letter expressing concern to the hiring authority, with a copy to the Chair of the Search and Screening Committee. The hiring authority shall review the concern and, in consultation with the Chairs of the College P&T Committee and the Search and Screening Committee, make a decision on whether or not to interview that finalist.

2. After a finalist is selected and offered the position:
  - a. **The Dean** notifies the prospective Department Head of the appointment.
  - b. **The Department Head** initiates an out-of-cycle review, and assists the new hire in preparing the dossier.

For new hires who DO NOT have indefinite tenure at their current institution, the dossier does not need to follow the OSU dossier format, but it:

- should contain a CV that demonstrates a record of scholarship;
- should contain documented evidence of effective teaching/mentoring of students;
- should contain documented record of university/professional service
- should contain independent outside letters of evaluation (these may be the same as those submitted as part of the application);
- does not need to contain an OSU student letter of evaluation

For new hires who DO have indefinite tenure at their current institution, compile a dossier [as instructed by Academic Affairs](#).

- c. P&T Review from this point follows the same process as [“In-cycle” Reviews](#) noted above in section C, including final review and approval by the Provost.

## Appendix A

### UNDERGRADUATE COURSES TAUGHT (EXAMPLE):

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

Year	# Students	Very Poor %	Poor %	Fair %	Good %	Very Good %	Excellent %	Unable to Rate %	Mean	Median
<b>COF 5-YR AVG. (03-08)</b>										
<b>Instructor Term/Year Course</b>										
S04 FE 3xx										
W05 FE 3xx										
W06 FE 4yz										
W07 FE 4yz										
W08 FE 4yz										
SP08 FE 2zz										

### GRADUATE COURSES TAUGHT (EXAMPLE):

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

Year	# Students	Very Poor %	Poor %	Fair %	Good %	Very Good %	Excellent %	Unable to Rate %	Mean	Median
<b>COF 5-YR AVG. (03-08)</b>										
<b>Instructor Term/Year Course</b>										
F04 FE 5xx										
F05 FE 5xx										
F06 FE 5xx										
F07 FE 6yz										

## Appendix B

Summary of all grant and contract support.

	# Attempts (as PI)**	# Funded (as PI)	Funding Rate (as PI)	Total \$	My Share \$
Competitive (total)					
Competitive, (External*)					
Competitive, (Internal*)					
Non-competitive					
Declined Pre-proposals					
Total (incl. pre-proposals)					

\*Internal or External to the institution that the PI was employed at time of submission

\*\*White papers, pre-proposals, full proposals, memorandum of agreements, joint venture agreements, Agricultural Research Foundation gifts, etc.