

College of Science Promotion and Tenure Dossier Guidance

7-1-2021

The Faculty Handbook describes the general procedures that need to be followed, but here are some places listed where special attention needs to be paid.

The dossier should contain all information since hiring. It should also contain all information from a previous institution if there is a prior service agreement and pertaining to the time set in a prior service credit agreement. The offer letter has to be included when there is such an agreement. The case is evaluated on all work done since the last promotion, or since the hiring date, including prior service in the approved time.

I. COVER PAGE

Include name of candidate, department and college, and what action is being requested (i.e. Promotion to Professor). The electronic system will add page numbers to the dossiers for you. Please do not add your own pagination. **DONE BY ADMINISTRATOR, NOT BY THE CANDIDATE.**

II. FORM A

Include check list [Form A](#). **DONE BY ADMINISTRATOR, NOT BY THE CANDIDATE. ADD OFFER LETTER FOR TENURE CASES WITH PRIOR SERVICE AGREEMENT.**

III. CONFIDENTIALITY WAIVER (optional)

All faculty have the option of signing a "[Waiver of Access](#)" form for outside letters of evaluation. The signed original should be included in this section. . Execution of the waiver is voluntary. If the candidate chooses not to sign the waiver of access, include a statement to that effect in this section. **THE WORDING IS OLD, CANDIDATE SIGNS ACCEPTING OR NOT ACCEPTING, BUT A SIGNATURE IS REQUIRED.**

IV. POSITION DESCRIPTION

A copy of the candidate's current position description must be included. If significant shifts in assignment have occurred, earlier position descriptions should be included. With significant assignment changes, include a table that summarizes FTE distribution among primary activities over time. Refer to the "[Guidelines for Position Descriptions for Academic Faculty](#)" to describe the allocation of FTE for a faculty member. **PROVIDED BY THE ADMINISTRATOR, CHECK ALL PDS ARE SIGNED.**

V. CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT

PART A: The candidate should include a statement (three page maximum, 12 point font, one inch margins) that addresses the individual's contributions in the areas of teaching, advising and

other assignments; scholarship and creative activity; and service. **DONE BY THE CANDIDATE**. In this statement, be clear, concise, and factual. Explain technical details to an audience with no background in the field. Make sure to include all relevant work, do not assume people higher up know what you are doing.

PART B: An optional COVID-19 impact statement may be included (one page maximum, 12 point font, one inch margins). COVID-19 impact statements describe the impact of the pandemic on the ability to perform duties in the position description. Impacts may include the following examples: personal circumstances that impede work, lack of access to research facilities and sites, inability to collect data, publication delays, cancelled conferences and seminars, or other circumstances attributable to the changed landscape of working under pandemic conditions.

DONE BY THE CANDIDATE.

VI. STUDENT LETTER OF EVALUATION (as appropriate)

As required by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, students will be invited to participate in the review of faculty for promotion and tenure.

Guidelines for the Student Evaluation Letter for Inclusion in the Promotion and Tenure Dossier (approved by Faculty Senate on June 12, 2008, approved by President Ray on July 20, 2008)

The purpose of the student evaluation letter is to document the student perspective of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher and advisor. In order to provide the university with a consistent source of information for the process, the unit P&T committee and the unit supervisor should endeavor to organize student committees for faculty evaluation using the following process.

1. The unit chair or head or designee requests a list of names of current and recent students, including advisees from the candidate.
2. The unit P&T committee and the supervisor (normally unit chair or head) jointly generate an additional list of student names.
3. The unit chair or head or designee requests letters of reference from that combined list. An attempt should be made to request input from students whose collective experience represents the profile of the teaching and advising duties of the faculty member. For example, if a faculty member teaches all undergraduate courses, it is appropriate for all letters to come from undergraduates. If the faculty member teaches a combination of courses, the students should have a combination of backgrounds that will provide sufficient information to evaluate the candidate's performance.
4. Letters to the students requesting the evaluative reference must inform the student as to who will see their review letters. Access to those letters will be determined by whether the candidate has signed a waiver of access. Students must also be informed that only signed letters will be used as part of the process.

5. As a rule ½ of the letters should be from the list generated by the candidate and ½ from the list generated by the unit. There is no specific minimum number of letters required. The total number of letters should be on the order of 4-12, depending on the complexity of the candidate's teaching duties.
6. Units that use a series of standardized questions to help guide student input are strongly encouraged to work with Faculty Affairs and OSU Legal Counsel prior to asking for information from students.
7. Letters received from student referees are kept on file in the unit office. Consult the OSU records retention schedule for the required period the letters must be kept on file (https://policy.oregonstate.edu/UPSM/04-010_records_retention .) The names of the students and the content of the letters are kept confidential if the candidate has signed a waiver of access.
8. The unit chair or head or designee will form a student committee, whose task it is to write a letter summarizing the input from student referees. Members of this committee:
 - Should be current students.
 - May be individuals from whom letters were solicited.
 - Should not be a current advisee of the candidate (letters from current advisees may be part of the student input).
9. The student committee is provided with the student referee letters, student oriented teaching and advising portion of the dossier (i.e. excluding faculty peer review), plus any additional available information pertinent to their review.
10. The student chair of the student committee is selected by the P&T committee or unit supervisor. The only duty of this committee is to write a summary letter that includes information from the student referee letters and the teaching and advising portion of the dossier.
11. The student committee should be instructed to include in its summary the perspectives represented by all the student referee letters (e.g. not to integrate opinions into an intermediate position).
12. All members of the committee sign the summary letter and present it to the unit P&T committee and unit supervisor. The summary letter and the names of the individuals on the student committee will be known to the candidate and P&T committee even if the candidate has signed a waiver of access.

The student committee section of the dossier must 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 (DocuSign is allowable).

[SAMPLE REQUEST FOR STUDENT COMMITTEE LETTER](#)

[SAMPLE REQUEST FOR STUDENT LETTER OF EVALUATION](#)

DONE BY ADMINISTRATOR, NOT BY THE CANDIDATE.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE LETTERS OF EVALUATION

- Departmental Faculty Committee Letter
- Department Chair or Department Head Letter
- Letters from Other Administrators with Supervisory Responsibility **NOTE THAT FOR FACULTY POSITIONS REPORTING TO A DIRECT SUPERVISOR A LETTER FROM THAT SUPERVISOR NEEDS TO GO HERE**
- College or Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee's Letter
- Dean, Director, Vice President, or Vice Provost's Letter

These letters are to evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. If the candidate reports to, or works closely with, more than one supervisor, letters from each should be included. These letters should not simply be a restatement of evaluations at lower administrative levels. Summarize and comment on key points in the letters of evaluation solicited from qualified reviewers in the candidate's field. Evaluators should be identified only by a coded reference number or letter when referring to a comment in a confidential letter. All letters must be signed by all committee members (DocuSign is allowable).

DONE BY ADMINISTRATOR, NOT BY THE CANDIDATE.

VIII. PROMOTION AND TENURE VITA

The vita for promotion and/or tenure review should be formatted to follow the section headings below.

A. EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

The year, major field of study, and degree obtained from each institution should be identified. The year, location, and institution for each position held since the baccalaureate should be included in this section. **Example:**

A1. Education

2002 Ph.D., Physics
 MIT
 Advisor: Thomas Edison

1994 B.S., Chemistry
 Stanford

A2. Professional Experience

Sept. 2006–present Assistant Professor
 Department of Mathematics
 Oregon State University

Jan 2003-Aug 2004 Postdoctoral Fellow
 Biophysics Department
 University of Delft, The Netherlands

B. TEACHING, ADVISING AND OTHER ASSIGNMENTS

1. Instructional Summary

- Credit Courses - Present a chronological listing of course numbers, term, year, and number of students enrolled.

Number	Course Title	Term/Year	Credits	Enrollment
PH211	Physics with calculus	Fall 2016	4	200
Etc		Winter 2017		

- Non-Credit Courses and Workshops - Present a chronological listing of noncredit courses, international training programs held in the U.S., workshops, seminars, Extension programs, and continuing education programs in which candidate has had a major responsibility. Indicate the candidate's role (program participant, program organizer, etc.).

Similar table or none if not applicable.

- Curriculum Development - List primary contributions in curriculum development and give dates (e.g. courses developed, curriculum committee service, etc.).

Describe or state none if not applicable.

- Graduate and Undergraduate Students and Postdoctoral Trainees - List current and former graduate and undergraduate students and postdoctoral trainees for whom the candidate has had a major instructional or mentoring responsibility. Indicate instructional role (major professor, graduate committee member, thesis or project mentor, etc.) and year the degree was or will be completed.

NOTE: This is in a new place compared to older guidelines.

NOTE: Wording for Postdoctoral Trainees has changed with the bargaining agreement, they are now called Postdoctoral Scholars. Since there is no other place for this, include supervision of Research Associates, Faculty Research Assistants, and Postdoctoral Fellows here as well.

Previous students and trainees. Suggestion is to list sorted by undergrad, grad, trainee

Name	Role	Degree	Thesis	Date
John Johnson	Research Advisor	BS	On Falling Objects	Fall 2020
Anne Green	Research Supervisor	Postdoctoral Scholar	N/A	Fall 2017 – Spring 2019
Alice Green	Committee Member	PhD	On floating objects	Fall 2020
Etc				

Current students and trainees

Name	Role	Degree	Expected Date
Mark Johnson	Research Advisor	BS	Spring 2022
Amy Green	Research Supervisor	Postdoctoral Scholar	
Etc			

- Team or Collaborative Efforts, If Any - Indicate special efforts undertaken to team or collaborate with another individual, group, or institution in the planning or delivery of instruction.

Describe or state none if not applicable.

- International Teaching, If Any - Identify instructional activities (short and long-term) and/or curricular developments that have taken place in countries other than the United States. Indicate the location, time frame, and nature of the teaching experience (i.e. workshop, seminar, course, etc.).

Describe or state none if not applicable.

2. Student and Participant/Client Evaluation

Summarize all course/program evaluations with numerical ratings. Results from evaluations by learners or participants of every course taught by the candidate should be included in tabular format. The number of students/clients in the course who submitted evaluations should be identified. The summary should include an analysis of performance over time, e.g. same course by term and year, as well as comparisons of the course to department and/or college norms on important variables such as required /not required, core or elective, and level (100, 200...), etc. Letters from individual students, clients, or program participants should not be included.

For information before COVID use the table below, for current procedures, follow the university guidelines, which will be coming out in June 2021.

Course	Credits	Term	Enrollment	Responding	Q1	Q1Dept	Q2	Q2Dept
PH211	4	Spring 2019	389	211	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.2
Etc								

Add an analysis of changes over time for the same course.

3. Peer Teaching Evaluations

Peer evaluations should be based on a review of course syllabi, texts, assigned reading, examinations, class materials, and other assessments such as attendance at lectures as appropriate for the field and subject area. 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.

DONE BY ADMINISTRATOR, NOT BY THE CANDIDATE.

4. Advising

Describe advising/counseling responsibilities, both formal academic advising (give number of student advisees, how often they typically meet with the adviser), and co-curricular advising (e.g. faculty adviser for student professional organization). Provide evaluations of advising performance, including dates, and describe how student input was obtained. Evaluation will consider the innovation and creativity of the services, and their effectiveness; it may be based on

systematic surveys of and assessments by students and former students who received these services, when signed by the students.

This section now asks about true advising/mentoring only. Research supervision for students is listed earlier.

5. Other Assignments

For faculty with primary responsibilities other than teaching and advising, information that identifies these duties and the indicators for assessing effectiveness should be included in this section.

- Other Assigned Duties - Provide a paragraph which describes or summarizes the assigned responsibilities, target audience, collaborative aspects, international activities and number of individuals served.
- Participant/Client Evaluation - Summarize evaluations highlighting the services provided and, to the extent possible, the impact of these services on identified needs.

Describe or state none if not applicable.

C. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Scholarship and creative activity are understood to be intellectual work whose significance is validated by peers and which is communicated. As specified in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, such work in its diverse forms is 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.

1. In identifying scholarly and creative activity, use appropriate headings (e.g. refereed publications, juried exhibits, non-refereed publications).

- Refereed papers or juried exhibitions or compositions should be listed separately from non-refereed papers or indicated with an asterisk.
- All authors should be given in the order they appear in the paper (not "with John Smith and Kathy Brown"). Date of publication, volume, and pages must be given. When work that is the product of joint effort is presented as evidence of scholarship, **clarification of the candidate's role in the joint effort should be provided in the dossier.**
- Where not obvious, the dossier should explain how the work was validated and communicated. It is also important to know the significance of the scholarship and creative activity and the stature of the sources in which they appear. These can be commented on after each listing, and discussed in letters of evaluation from the promotion and tenure committee, the Department Chair, Head, Director, or Dean.

Note the importance of clarifying the role in the publications!

Examples:

- I led the analysis and writing.
- I led and executed this project.
- I wrote this manuscript with feedback from coauthors.
- I co-developed the conceptual framework for this paper, and contributed to the analysis and writing.
- I developed the model analyzed in this paper and contributed to the analyses.
- Work by PhD student ****; I contributed to study design, data analyses, and writing/editing of the paper
- I participated in conceptualization of the study, preparation of many samples, and helped write the paper
- As PI, I funded a large portion of this collaborative study, collected much of the raw data, performed most of the computational and statistical analyses, and wrote most of the manuscript.

Create separate lists for the following:

- Books and book chapters
- Refereed Journal Publications
- Peer-reviewed Archival Conference Publications
- Other Peer-reviewed publications
- Papers currently under peer review or accepted but not yet published (state which)
- Other publications

Candidates should separate publications based on work done while at OSU from those based on work done before being hired at OSU. Manuscripts in preparation should not be listed.

2. For professional meetings, symposia, and conferences, note the dates, location, and role of the faculty member (e.g. organizer, chair, invited speaker, discussant, presenter). Where these are presented as scholarship or creative activity, explain the validation process and the significance or stature of the event.

Also add participation in invitational workshops.

3. List grant and contract support (dollar amount) along with funding agency, dates and name of principal investigator.

Use the following layout for presenting the information.

Agency	Dates	PIs	Co-PIs	Title	Total Budget	Candidate's share of budget
NSF	1/18-12/21	Names	Names	Study of falling and	\$333,123	\$75,244

				floating bodies		
Etc						

4. List patent awards, cultivar releases, and inventions, with titles and dates.

Describe or state none if not applicable.

5. List other information appropriate to one's discipline.

Describe or state none if not applicable.

D. SERVICE

Faculty service is essential to the University's success in achieving its central mission. Service is an expectation for promotion for all ranks at Oregon State University.

1. University Service

List departmental, college, and University committees (or other responsibilities), with dates.

2. Service to the Profession

List involvement with professional associations/societies, especially offices held, research advisory or review panels, and other evidence of regional, national, or international stature and service to the profession. Provide dates for all activities.

Include journal editorships, conference and workshop organization, conference program committees, and grant and journal reviewing. List agency or journal and approximate number of articles reviewed per year for that journal.

3. Service to the Public (professionally related)

List service provided to the public which is consistent with professional training and responsibilities. Provide dates. Service that is relevant to a faculty member's assignment, and which draws upon professional expertise or contributes significantly to university relations, is considered and valued in promotion and tenure decision.

4. Service to the Public (non-professionally related) (optional)

Community service not directly related to the faculty member's appointment, though valuable in itself, and ideally a responsibility of all citizens, is considered in promotion and tenure decisions to the extent that it contributes to the University.

5. If service is a significant percentage of FTE, outcomes or impact should be described.

E. AWARDS

Include awards received from professional organizations/societies, Oregon State University, civic or community groups. The nature of the award (including its stature and significance) and reason received, e.g., teaching and advising, scholarship, etc., should be identified. The awards should be grouped, to the extent possible, into the following headings.

1. National and International Awards
2. State and Regional Awards
3. University and Community Awards

IX. LETTERS OF EVALUATION

DONE BY ADMINISTRATOR, NOT BY THE CANDIDATE.

Solicited Letters of Evaluation from Outside Leaders in the Field (6 minimum, 8 maximum for professorial faculty; 4 for Faculty Research Assistants and instructors)

For professorial faculty, letters should generally be from leaders in the candidate's field, chosen for their ability to evaluate the parts of the dossier for which they have specific expertise. Letters should not be solicited from co-authors or co-principal investigators who collaborated with the candidate in the last five years. In general, letters should not be solicited from former post-doctoral advisers, professors, or former students. If letters from any of these generally excluded evaluators are critical to candidate assessment, a detailed explanation of why their participation is essential and of why there is expectation for objectivity must be provided by the unit leader who requested their letter. Letters should generally be from tenured professors or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. External letters for professorial faculty should never be solicited from clients or others whom the candidate has directly served in his/her work.

Professorial candidates must submit a list of 5-8 evaluators who meet the criteria stated above and from this list at least three letters will be obtained for the final dossier. If additional names are needed, these will be obtained from the candidate by the unit head. The other evaluators are to be selected by the chair, head, dean, or faculty committee according to practices determined within the unit. All letters must be requested by the unit chair, head, dean, or the unit's promotion and tenure committee chair, not the candidate. Provide a brief (paragraph) description of the outside evaluators that makes it clear that they meet the criteria. More detail must be provided if an evaluator would generally be excluded, per the preceding paragraph. Clearly indicate which outside reviewers were chosen by the candidate. If an evaluator was suggested by both the candidate and others, that evaluator will be considered among the candidate's pool of evaluators unless there is clear indication in the description of that evaluator why he/she should be included in the "other evaluator" pool. In the final dossier, no more than half of the letters of evaluation can be from the list suggested by the candidate.

For FRA's and Instructors four letters of evaluation are to be obtained. In general, the letters must be from individuals who hold a rank at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered, or an experience level equivalent to such a rank. Ability to objectively evaluate is the driver in selecting evaluators. Evaluators may be internal or external to OSU. Internal evaluators may be individuals who have worked with the candidate but can objectively evaluate the candidate's dossier.

FRA and instructor candidates must submit a list of four evaluators who meet the criteria stated above and, from this list, two letters will be obtained for the final dossier. If additional names are needed, these will be obtained from the candidate by the unit head. The other evaluators are to be

selected by the chair, head, dean, or faculty committee according to practices determined within the unit. All letters must be requested by the unit chair, head, dean, or the unit's promotion and tenure committee chair, not the candidate. Provide a brief (paragraph) description of the outside evaluators that makes it clear that they meet the criteria. Additional detail must be provided if an evaluator is not of a rank at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered, if they have been suggested based on experience level equivalency, and/or if they are internal to OSU and have worked with the candidate. Clearly indicate which outside reviewers were chosen by the candidate. If an evaluator was suggested by both the candidate and others, that evaluator will be considered among the candidate's pool of evaluators unless there is clear indication in the description of that evaluator why he/she should be included in the "other evaluator" pool. In the final dossier, no more than half of the letters of evaluation can be from the list suggested by the candidate.

A representative form letter can be found at: [SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVE FORM](#) (doc), but any reasonable variation is acceptable. Include a copy of the actual letter used. Each reviewer should be sent a copy of the candidate's position description, candidate's statement, and current vita. Copies of publications are not usually sent to reviewers, but may be sent at the discretion of the individual soliciting the letter. Provide a log of contacts with the reviewers, including letters and telephone calls. Letters from external reviewers should be available prior to initiating the review of the dossier.

X. OTHER LETTERS AND MATERIALS (optional)

Additional letters from sources other than administrators, unit promotion and tenure committees, the student committee, and external reviewers are not necessary. Signed letters of support or advocacy from friends, colleagues, students, and clients should be included only if they are necessary for fairness and balance. If there is some compelling reason to include such letters, the unit supervisor should write a statement identifying the significance of the letters, whether solicited or unsolicited, and the need to include them in the dossier. All letters should be letters of evaluation and should be open to the candidate. Include any other material that may be relevant to a full and fair review.

This section is also used for significant updates on the dossier after it is signed for completeness. Factual errors can be corrected at any point, but a note should be made in the dossier when it was updated. I suggest using this section for such notes. While the dossier is discussed in the unit, the department head is responsible for incorporating changes and for informing all parties. Once the dossier is in the college, units should forward all changes/additions to the college, so they can be included properly and all parties can be notified. Rebuttal letters should be placed according to the upload instructions.

DO NOT INCLUDE COPIES OF PAPERS.

XI. CANDIDATE'S SIGNED STATEMENT

Prior to the dossier receiving its first formal review by the unit promotion and tenure committee, the candidate should sign a statement that he or she has reviewed the open part of the dossier and

that it is complete and current. The candidate retains the right of access to recommendations added by deans, heads, chairs, directors, and unit promotion and tenure committees.

INITIATED BY ADMINISTRATOR, NOT BY THE CANDIDATE. CANDIDATE SHOULD RECEIVE A COMPLETE COPY OF THE OPEN PART OF THE DOSSIER AT THIS TIME.