

Guidance for Content and Formatting of Promotion and Tenure Dossiers College of Agricultural Sciences

Bernadine Strik and Pat Kennedy
Co-chairs, CAS Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee
Nov. 10, 2011

The college faculty committee review shall provide: (i) an independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate as presented in the dossier, (ii) an opinion as to whether the departmental-level letters of evaluation fairly and uniformly assess the merits of the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier, and (iii) an assessment of the consistency of standards applied to all candidates in the college. In addition, the committee should check that each dossier has been properly prepared. Our experience on the CAS faculty review committee has informed our opinions of common problems seen in preparation of the dossier for mid-term review and promotion and tenure of candidates and in formatting of the vita.

Contents of Dossier

Note: all of the following are required for the mid-term review except for the letters from external evaluators (promotion and tenure only).

Cover page

- Candidate name, department, table of contents. Number all pages

Form A

Position description

- The position description is where the specific work assignments and expectations for the faculty are enumerated. This document serves as the basis for evaluating whether the candidate has met the criteria for promotion and tenure. The three criteria relate to: 1) performance of assigned duties; 2) scholarly achievement; and 3) service. See <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#criteria> for the definition of scholarship and the specific criteria and expectations for granting tenure and promotion.
- The first requirement of the position description is that it clearly delineates the candidate's assigned duties as the basis for assessing the candidate's performance of those duties. The format must follow university guidelines: http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/sites/default/files/documents/Guidelines_Position_Descriptions.doc with assigned duties divided among teaching, advising, research, extension, and service. These assignments reflect how the candidate is expected to allocate their time and must add up to 100%.
- **Under the University's definition of scholarship, research is not synonymous with scholarship.** This distinction is particularly important for a college with the diversity of positions found in the College of Agricultural Sciences. Thus, the second requirement of the position description is that it clearly specifies what proportion of the candidate's assigned duties is expected to generate scholarly outputs, as well as the types of scholarly output

expected for that particular position. A minimum of 15% of the candidate's effort is expected to result in scholarly output; for some positions, scholarly outputs may comprise the majority of the expectation for the position. For example, a faculty research assistant with a 100% research appointment may only have a 15% scholarship expectation. An endowed research professor with assigned duties of 100% research might have an 80% scholarship expectation. For faculty with split appointments, the scholarship can come from any or all of the areas of assigned duties (e.g. scholarship of teaching, research or Extension).

- More than one position description is required if duties changed during the period of evaluation.

Candidate's Statement

- Must follow OSU format guidelines: 3-page, 1 inch margins, 12 font rule
- Encourage candidates to highlight programmatic overviews and contributions (outcomes and impact) in the areas of responsibilities defined in the position description, service, and scholarly outcomes.

Student Committee Letter (candidates with a teaching and/or advising responsibility only)

- Documents the students' perspective of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher and advisor
- The dossier should include a description of the process used in the unit for the selection of the student committee; a copy of the instructions given to the students; a short description of the group of students that provided letters, the nature of their relationship to the faculty member and whether the candidate or the P&T committee nominated the student to be a member of the committee; and the summary letter from the student committee, signed by the members of the committee (refer to current University guidelines for more specific information on the process).

Clientele Survey (candidates with an extension appointment only)

A summary is provided of clientele surveys that clearly demonstrates an independent evaluation of the extension program. Similar to teaching evaluations the methods used to obtain these evaluations needs to be documented.

Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee letter

The letter should evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance and should comment on key points in the dossier, address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. The letter must address key points (including any negative comments) in external letters of evaluation (coded to protect confidentiality).

Unit letters of evaluation

If the candidate reports to, or works closely with, more than one supervisor and more than one unit, letters from each supervisor should be included. The letters from the supervisor(s) evaluates the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance and should comment on key points in the dossier, address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations.

Letter summarizing peer teaching evaluation

- Candidates with a teaching appointment are required to have substantive peer evaluations of teaching. “Peer evaluations should be based both on classroom observations and on review of course syllabi, texts, assigned reading, examinations, and class materials. Where possible, evaluation is enhanced by evidence of student learning.” “Peer teaching evaluations should be systematic and on-going, following unit guidelines for peer review of teaching. A letter from the peer teaching review committee that summarizes all peer teaching reviews over the evaluation timeframe should be included in the dossier.”
- For extension faculty, several peer-reviews of non-credit teaching are suggested with either a summary letter (from peer teaching committee) or a summary presented in this section of the CV.
- By the mid-term review, one substantive peer review of teaching for teaching faculty (one course) is expected. This should be followed by another before the dossier is submitted for promotion and tenure to meet the criteria for “systematic and on-going” evaluation.

Promotion and Tenure Vita

- See comments about formatting below.
- Faculty with responsibilities other than teaching (e.g. research, extension, administration, and service if a significant portion of FTE) should highlight their programs in section B.5 of the CV. Dividing programs into “Situation”, “Outcomes and impact” and “Scholarship” has worked well.
 - Impact of research (impact factors), teaching (student evaluations, letters, accomplishments, awards), and extension (\$ values from programs, documented behavioral change) must be well documented.
 - Note that scholarship is defined as creative activity whose significance is validated by peers and which is communicated. Such work may be diverse, but is based on a high level of professional expertise, is original, and must be communicated and validated by peers. Presentations to peers must be documented in the vita (see “formatting the CV”) and there must be evidence of validation. Peer refereed papers are evidence of validation of scholarship. The number of peer-reviewed (non-refereed) papers/publications is NOT validation of scholarship. Candidates must clearly document how scholarly work was validated by peers (e.g. method for publishing refereed maps; an OSU Extension publication that is being used by peers in their educational programs outside of region – based on position description, etc.).
- Section C. Scholarship
 - University guidelines indicate “clarification of the candidate's role in the joint effort should be provided” in the section for publications. Considering this section of the CV documents scholarly work, we recommend this be done by indicating the candidate’s role after each refereed publication, substantive Extension publications or book chapters, and the candidate’s share of the funds on grants that have multiple investigators. Graduate and undergraduate student and post-doc co-authors should be indicated by a footnote or “*”.
 - Presentations to peers should be clearly illustrated in this section.
 - Grants should be summarized by year and dollar amounts totaled for entire grant and candidate’s program share.

External Letters of Evaluation (excluded for mid-term review except under extraordinary cases)

- Solicited letters of evaluation from outside leaders in the field (5 minimum, 8 maximum for professorial faculty; 4 for Faculty Research Assistants and Instructors).
- Note: Include a copy of the actual letter sent to external reviewers. Provide a log of contacts with the reviewers, including letters and telephone calls.

Formatting the CV – clarifications

- Divide each section of the CV into “Prior to present position” and “Prior to last promotion” as appropriate for the candidate
- Section B.1.ii. “non-credit courses and workshops” include courses/classes taught to audiences that are not peers – including outreach programs to clientele for Extension faculty. Begin this section with a summary table that gives number of events by year within and outside the region of responsibility (based on position description) and the number of invited events. List teaching events in reverse chronological order and indicate the candidate's role (program participant, program organizer, presenter, etc.).
- Highlight collaborative teaching programs in Section B.1.v.
- “International teaching” in Section B.1.vi may include outreach training or teaching to clientele internationally (e.g. USAID work, invited presentations to growers in another country)
- Summarize research and extension programs (if applicable) in Section B.5. divided into headings as suggested above. Do NOT repeat citations of publications or grant lists in “scholarship” section, rather summarize scholarly outputs in a sentence.
- Include a section on collaborative research and extension programs (if applicable) in Section B.5
- Section B.2 “Student and Participant/Client Evaluation”, must include unit and CAS averages for each term/year/course for SET scores presented. Teachers may choose to present all SET scores (include questions then) or may only highlight SET1 and SET2 averages.
- Section B.4. “Advising”. Only include information here if a formal advising responsibility is listed in the position description.
- Section C. Scholarship
 - “Publications” – divide this section into “Peer-reviewed” (sub-headings may include “refereed papers”; “Extension publications”; “Book Chapters” etc.) and “Other” (sub-headings may include “Proceedings articles”; “Abstracts from conferences without published proceedings”; “Newsletters”; “Videos”; “Websites”; “Trade or industry articles” etc.). The candidate’s role should be stated under each refereed

publication and substantive Extension publications and book chapters. Graduate and undergraduate student and post-doc co-authors should be indicated by a footnote or “*”. It is helpful to begin this section with a summary table showing numbers of publications (by type) by year when the candidate has long lists for each category.

- “Presentations to peers”. Begin this section with a summary table that gives number of events nationally and internationally and the number of invited events by year. List presentations in reverse chronological order after the table – do NOT repeat events that are indicated elsewhere (e.g. in Abstracts or proceedings articles).