Forestry Executive Committee Meeting

AGENDA for Friday, May 6, 2016

8:00 AM – 10:00 AM
Richardson Hall 115

8:00 a.m. **Agenda Review and Suggestions for Additional Items** – *Thomas Maness*

8:05 a.m. **Update on Provost's Transition** – *Thomas Maness*

8:15 a.m. **Hosting the 2018 Pacific Logging Congress** – *Steve Fitzgerald & Jeff Wimer*
The Research Forests will host the PLC and planning is starting now!

8:45 a.m. **FEC Charter** – *Jim Johnson*
For approval *(See schedule attached)*

8:50 a.m. **AD/Director for Research Search: Prep for Meeting with Candidates** – *Jim Johnson*
Discussion and development of questions for the FEC meetings with the candidates.
(See schedule attached)

9:00 a.m. **Meeting Room Scheduling Guidelines** – *Adrienne Wonhof*
Discussion of draft of new Admin. Memo #130 related to guidelines and priority for
room scheduling during Peavy renovation for approval. *(See attachment)*

9:05 a.m. **College P&T Committee Recommendations** – *Adrienne Wonhof/Mark Harmon*
Presentation of recommended revisions of Admin. Memo 3-3a for approval. *(See attachment)*

9:15 a.m. **Information Sharing:**

- Digital Measures Update and Discussion on Whether to Require in the Coming Year – *Mike Altimus and Troy Hall*
- International Programs – *John Bliss and Michele Justice*
- FSC Architects Visit Schedule *(See schedule attached)*

9:30 a.m. **CORE Reports/Dashboard Highlights** – *Michael Hansen, Manager, Budget Planning*
Presentation

10:00 a.m. **Adjourn**

(Over)

2016 IMPORTANT DATES	Future FEC Topics
• **Assoc. Dean/Director of Research Candidate Interviews** Monday, May 9 · 9:00-10:00 AM – Candidate Presentation and Q&A, RH 107 · 10:00-11:00 AM – Open Forum with Faculty, RH 107 Monday, May 16 · 9:00-10:00 AM – Candidate Presentation and Q&A, RH 107 · 10:00-11:00 AM – Open Forum with Faculty, RH 107 Monday, May 23 · 9:00-10:00 AM – Candidate Presentation and Q&A, RH 107 · 10:00-11:00 AM – Open Forum with Faculty, RH 107 • **Architects COF Visit,** May 11-13 • **Spring Honors Reception**, May 12, 4:30-6:00 PM, CH2MHill Alumni Center • "**Hello, Goodbye: Farewell to Original Peavy,** May 18, 12:00 – 4:00 PM, Peavy Courtyard • **Get Outdoors Day**, May 21, 10:00-3:00 PM, Peavy Arboretum • **Commencement Dinner**, June 10, 5:00-8:30 PM, Forestry Club Cabin • **OSU Commencement and CoF Commencement Continental Breakfast,** June 11, 8:00 – 9:15 AM, Peavy Courtyard	1. University Honor's College Opportunities – Tara Williams, Assoc. Dean, UHC (Tentative June 3rd) 2. Initiative to support faculty success in Research Action Planning Update – Department Heads (TBD)

Administrative Memo #256
Forestry Executive Committee Charter
draft March 2016

Background

The Forestry Executive Committee (FEC) and its precursors have been functional in the College of Forestry for several decades. The mission of the FEC is to serve as an advisory board to the Dean of the College of Forestry, who has executive decision-making powers. The Dean recognizes the importance of faculty, administrative, and graduate student input to the decision-making process, and feels that better decisions come when all viewpoints are considered. The FEC is NOT a decision-making body, rather, it exists to *inform* decisions made by the Dean.

Accordingly, the mission of the FEC is to provide the Dean of the College of Forestry with the following:

   a. diverse perspectives on the administration and management of the College;
   b. a conduit outward to faculty, students, and staff regarding the administration of the College; and
   c. connection to the active committees of the College.

Composition

The FEC is composed of the following administrative and faculty members: Dean, Special Assistant to the Dean, Associate Deans, Department Heads, Directors, faculty representatives (one per Department), and a representative of the Graduate Student Council. Faculty representatives serve two year terms, must have achieved tenure status, and are selected on a voluntary basis by their Department Heads, with approval of the Dean. Faculty representatives should represent the range of diversity in the College (age, gender, ethnicity, academic expertise, etc.). Faculty representatives also serve as direct links between the College Administration and the faculty, staff, and students in their departments, and are asked to report information from FEC back to departmental meetings, and bring topics from the Departments to the FEC for consideration and/or discussion to promote awareness among the leadership team of the College.

Meetings

The FEC meets monthly, but may meet more often, as the need arises. Meeting times vary, depending upon the agenda, and they may range from one hour to a half day. Meeting agendas are posted on the FEC website (located on the Dean's webpage) and in COF Today, and the agendas are set by the Dean's Staff (see below) in consultation with the Dean. Agenda topics are open and any member of the College may suggest a topic for the FEC agenda. Meetings are open and all members of the College are welcome to participate. Minutes are kept for each meeting, and are posted on the FEC website within a week of each meeting.

Relationship to the Dean's Staff

The other administrative group in the College of Forestry is the Dean's Staff, formerly known as the Forestry Executive Team (FET). The Dean's Staff consists of Associate Deans, Directors, Department Heads, and the Special Assistant to the Dean. The Dean's staff typically meets bi-monthly. Meetings are variable in length, ranging from an hour to several hours. The Dean's Staff generally sets the FEC agendas and also provides feedback to the Dean to assist in the decision-making process. However, the Dean's Staff meetings are not open and may deal with confidential matters, including budget and personnel. The FEC and Dean's Staff complement each other, and work in tandem to provide the best information and advice to the Dean.

The full schedule for the Assoc Dean/Director of Research Interviews is below, each visit is identical. The CVs and other info will be available at: http://deansoffice.forestry.oregonstate.edu/search-associate-deandirector-research.

- Candidate A: May 8-10
- Candidate B: May 15-17
- Candidate C: May 22-24

Sunday evening: dinner with Associate Deans

Monday:
Breakfast with Jim
8:00 – tour of research facilities with Steve Tesch
9:00 – Candidate presentation followed by Q&A (RH 107)
10:00- Open forum with the Faculty (RH 107)
11:15 – Meeting with Paul Anderson, Forest Service (FSL) *tentative
12:00 – Lunch with Melora and Steve
1:30 – Meeting with Co-op Directors (RH 115)
3:00 – Interview with Search Committee (PVY 143)
5:00 – Drinks with Associate Deans for Research across campus (Dan Edge group, del Alma)
6:00 – Dinner with Interview Committee (del Alma)

Tuesday:
8:30 – Meeting with Cindy Sagers & Rich Holdren (Research Office)
9:30 – Meeting with Forestry Executive Committee (RH 115)
11:00 – WebEx with External Stakeholders (IWFL Board Members, Govt, Donor, OFIC, etc., PVY 143)
12:00 ish – Lunch with Thomas (Big River)
After…tour of Corvallis highlights, forests, schools, etc. depending on requests by each candidate

Adrienne
Work: (541) 737-4279
Cell: (530) 312-9042

May 6, 2016

TO: FORESTRY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

RE: **PROPOSED NEW ADMINISTRATIVE MEMO #130 – MEETING ROOM SCHEDULING GUIDELINES**

As we draw nearer to the time when Peavy is offline for construction, it became apparent that there was a need for an agreement on how College personnel would prioritize scheduling of the limited number of conference/meeting rooms remaining available in Richardson. The Resource Managers (staff from departments, programs and the dean's office) met on March 17 and agreed upon the enclosed principles and priorities for shared use during the construction period. Once New Peavy is operational, there may be a need to revise these guidelines to become less restrictive as meeting space should be more available.

In addition to agreeing upon priorities, this group also conferred with Mike Altimus to determine what IT solutions there were to restricting scheduling access. It was agreed that the common meeting spaces would only be able to be reserved by the Resource Managers group; others wishing to reserve space should contact a Resource Manager (staff in department, dean's office, business office, etc.).

Administrative Memo # 130
Meeting Room Scheduling Guidelines
May 6, 2016

Purpose

College controlled meeting/conference rooms include all shared spaces not held solely as classrooms. Equitable and collegial sharing of these spaces is required of all users reserving meeting space in the College. By reserving College meeting rooms, users agree to abide by these guidelines; failure to do so may result in reservation rights being revoked.

Scheduling Privileges

The College has an identified group of Resource Managers. Resource Managers have privileges in the calendaring system to reserve College meeting rooms and are able to reserve rooms on behalf of others. Resource Managers are typically those personnel in each unit with responsibility for organizing meetings, conferences and events; this typically includes staff in departments, the business office, the dean's office, student services, extension, continuing education, etc. Resource Managers may edit their own reservations, but they do not have privileges to edit or delete any other user reservation.

Scheduling Etiquette

- When reserving a room in the calendaring system, users must include the following information:
    - Subject Line: Meeting name (User Name) ; Location Line: Phone (7-XXXX), Date Reserved
- Reservations must include enough time for setup and breakdown if catering is expected and/or furniture will be setup in a manner different from the typical layout.
- Reservations should be appropriate to meeting capacities and technological needs. For example, a meeting of a handful of people should be scheduled in a smaller room, thereby allowing larger groups to use high capacity rooms; meetings without a videoconferencing need should be scheduled in low-tech rooms; etc.
- Reservations must be canceled promptly to allow other users full access to rooms; users should remember to cancel "held" reservations when the meeting is confirmed.
- Reservations must be calendared, even if the room is empty and your group just "pops in".
- Meetings must come to end promptly when there is another reservation for the room on the calendar.
- A new reservation may not "bump" an existing reservation unless the priority matrix (see below) indicates that the new reservation has priority. Users are welcome to politely inquire as to whether the existing reservation can be moved and to offer to find another comparable room for the existing reservation. If the existing reservation can reasonably be accommodated in another room or at another time, the user may agree to move their reservation; however, if there are circumstances that make moving the existing reservation excessively inconvenient, or if the alternate room does meet need, then the existing reservation retains rights to the room. Even in cases where priority necessitates bumping, users should endeavor to assist the "bumped" reservation in finding alternate meeting space. All users agree to conduct reservations in a collegial manner and be as accommodating as possible to each other.

<u>Maintenance</u>
Users have responsibility to reset the furniture back to the typical layout after their meeting, unless arrangements were made prior to meeting with the next scheduled user. Users are required to clean up any trash or catering items left in the room. Should there be significant cleanup issues (spills, dirty carpet, damage, etc.), the user has responsibility to contact the building maintenance team and will incur any related costs. The College will provide deep cleaning of meeting rooms at least annually.

Scheduling Priority

As noted above, the priority matrix determines whether new reservations may bump existing reservations. In cases where priority necessitates bumping, the new reservation user should endeavor to assist the bumped reservation user in finding alternate meeting space.

<u>Reservation Priority Matrix</u>
1. Classes identified by the College course scheduler that are required to be held in Richardson 107 due to the Peavy Reconstruction Project. *This priority use will be reconsidered once the New Peavy classrooms come online.*
2. All-College Meetings, Department Meetings, Forestry Executive Council, Forestry Executive Team, and Dean's Priority Meetings (e.g. Donor Visits).
3. Faculty recruitment/candidate interviews/seminars, and new student recruitment activities/events.
4. Research Advisory Boards (e.g. IWFL).
5. Other College/Departmental meetings/events, lab group meetings, student defenses, and student club meetings/activities. *Recognized student clubs and students conducting defenses may use meeting rooms in the MU and classrooms (the College Course Scheduler can assist).*
6. Cooperative and Continuing Education Conferences. *Conferences that charge fees for participation should build in fees for reserving other campus conference space.*

Groups from outside the College may not utilize/reserve College meeting rooms in order to preserve as much meeting space for College users as possible. *This restriction will be reconsidered once the New Peavy conference rooms come online.*

Arbiter of Disputes

In cases where priority is disputed and the parties cannot come to agreement, priority will determined by the Special Assistant to the Dean and/or the Manager of the Business Office. These arbiters also have master privileges to edit and delete reservations and have responsibility for acting on complaints regarding maintenance issues.

Approval:

_____

Thomas Maness, Cheryl Ramberg-Ford and Allyn C. Ford Dean   Date

May 6, 2016

TO: FORESTRY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

RE: **PROPOSED CHANGES TO P&T GUIDELINES AND ADMINISTRATIVE MEMOS
3, 3A, 4, and 28**

In February 2016, near the completion of the completion of the P&T process for 2015, the College P&T Committee Chair, Mark Harmon, met with departmental heads and staff, as well as representatives from the Dean's Office to discuss the P&T process. Chair Harmon identified a few inconsistencies in the dossier preparation process and recommended some changes to the College guidelines (administrative memos) that may provide better consistency in the future. Department Heads and staff with responsibility for the P&T process at different points also identified improvements that could be made in the documentation and guidelines that would help departmental committees and faculty better understand the process.

All of these recommendations are summarized below and are noted in the attached draft revised Administrative Memo 3 and 3A.

Summary of Suggested Revisions

Administrative Memo 3 & 3A:

- Section I - PURPOSE (d), page 1
  Inclusion of the responsibility for suggesting process improvements to the College P&T Committee charge.

- Section – PROCESS (a), page 3
  Addition of language to specify that P&T evaluation is tied to specific criteria outlined in the OSU Faculty Handbook. Addition of language specifying what the Departmental P&T Committee evaluation letter should include.

- Section II – SUPPLEMENTAL PREPARATION GUIDELINES (2), page 5
  Notation that adding pagination to dossiers is not allowed.

- Section II – SUPPLEMENTAL PREPARATION GUIDELINES (6), page 5
  Addition of Peer Teaching Evaluation letter requirements.

- APPENDIX A – EXAMPLE FORMATS, page 8
  Question: what is the best format for reporting of grants? Should competitive and non-competitive be separated? A consistent format would be helpful to develop and include here.

- General formatting enhancements were made to the document that did not alter the content.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION: In addition to these improvements, it seems prudent to review the various CoF Administrative Memos related to P&T (3, 3A, 4, 28, defunct 32) and consider combining all into one inclusive document that references the OSU Faculty Handbook appropriately and includes general dates for milestones.

Administrative Memo # 3 & 3a
College of Forestry
College-level Promotion and Tenure Committee and
Promotion and Tenure Dossier Guidelines
Revised ~~August, 2015~~ February 2016

I. College-level Promotion and Tenure Committee (Admin. Memo 3)

PURPOSE

The OSU Faculty Handbook on procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure requires each College to maintain a College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Faculty Handbook Website:
http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#general.

The purpose of the College of Forestry (CoF) P&T Committee:

(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. 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 second role of the Committee is to review the dossiers and recommend changes, if any, that could strengthen or clarify the presentation of the candidate's accomplishments.

(c) The College P&T Committee will also provide independent evaluations, per part (a) above, of candidates selected for CoF senior faculty and administrator positions that include awarding of indefinite tenure and/or appointment at the rank of Professor. [The exception is for the position of dean, for which that determination is made by the Provost.] These evaluations are likely to occur outside of the normal annual schedule for reviewing dossiers.

(d) To periodically review the college level process and suggest clarifications and improvements to the Forestry Executive Committee (FEC).

Comment [HM1]: This is currently an assumed responsibility, but since the COF is in position to spot systematic issues, they probably should have a specific responsibility

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

[Note the two options, (a) in-cycle reviews, and (b) searches for senior faculty/administrators]

(a) For standard "in-cycle" faculty reviews:

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.

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.

   Comment [HM2]: This is to make sure that the letter can be tied directly to the criteria

   Comment [HM3]: This just makes the outcome perfectly clear.

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.

   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.

   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.

5. 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.

(b) For reviews associated with searches for senior faculty and administrator positions that may include awarding of indefinite tenure and/or appointment at the rank of Professor:

1. The **Chair of the College P&T Committee** will assign a member(s) to be embedded with the Search and Screening Committee 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, the **College P&T Committee** will utilize the findings from its initial evaluation to craft an official letter of evaluation of the selectee's qualifications for indefinite tenure and/or the rank of Professor. This letter will be forwarded by the Dean, along with the letters of evaluation from the Department P&T Committee, the Department Head or other responsible hiring authority as is appropriate, and the Dean, to the Provost to complete the hiring process.

II. College Supplemental Guidelines for Preparing the P&T Dossier (Admin. Memo 3a)

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/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dossier

<u>Supplemental Preparation Guidelines</u>

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. <u>Complete Dossier:</u> 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 Process:</u> 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. The electronic system will add page numbers to the dossier. **Do not add your own pagination.**

   > **Comment [HM4]:** Seems like this point has been missed in the past

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>Peer Teaching Evaluation:</u> 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 <u>OSU Faculty Handbook</u> (section VIII.B.3).

   > **Comment [HM5]:** This was not in the list of items under teaching. There are issues of where this goes, a letter seems odd in the CV, but evidently that is where it is supposed to go. A point to raise at a higher level?

7. <u>SET Scores:</u> 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 <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."

     o Results should be grouped by specific classes, and then arranged chronologically. (e.g. all the FE xxx together, followed by the FE zzz)

     o Insert your SET scores by course for instructor (see SET form).

   [see Appendix A for example formats]

8. <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]

9. 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.

10. Citations of Presentations 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.

11. Grant Reporting

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.

[see Appendix A for example format]

Related Materials

College of Forestry Faculty Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Administrative Memo 4)
Intended to help faculty understand and meet the P&T criteria and to help those preparing or evaluating the documentation of faculty accomplishments.

College of Forestry Professorial Faculty Reviews (Administrative Memo 28)
Outlines the procedures for annual, interim and post-tenure faculty review.

Oregon State University Faculty Handbook: Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

See Appendix A on the following page for Example Formats

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE FORMATS

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
COF 5-YR AVG. (03-08)										
Instructor Term/Year Course										
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
COF 5-YR AVG. (03-08)										
Instructor Term/Year Course										
F04 FE 5xx										
F05 FE 5xx										
F06 FE 5xx										
F07 FE 6yz										

Add an example of the format that grants should be reported?

GRANT REPORTING (EXAMPLE):

Comment [HM6]: The guidelines are clear on what should be reported, but not necessarily how. Probably the most inconsistent part of current CV's. Should these be listed as publications? As a table? Should competitive and non-competitive be separated or comingled and coded?

FSC Project - WORKSHOP 6

Date Revised: April 22, 2016

Time   Subject   Location

Time	Subject	Location			
Tuesday, May 10, 2016					
1:30-3:00 pm	Meet w/ City of Corvallis				
3:30-5:00 pm	Core Team Meeting	Peavy 143			
Wednesday, May 11, 2016					
Focus Groups	**Track 1**		**Track 2**		
8:30-9:30	FERM/Faculty Offices	Pvy 282	8:30-9:30	FIR	Pvy 143
9:45-10:45	Grad Student Offices	Pvy 282	9:45-10:45	Schedule of Cash Outflow (Geoff, Nat, Libby, Harmik)	Pvy 143
11:00-12:00	Advising/Student Services	Pvy 282	11:00-11:30	Burn Table	Pvy 143
12:00-1:30	Lunch				
1:30-2:30	Classroom AV Requirements	Pvy 282	1:00-3:00	AWP	Pvy 143
2:45-3:45	IT Computing	Pvy 282			
4:00-5:00 pm	Dean's Suite/Comm/Ext/Events	Pvy 282			
Thursday, May 12, 2016					
Focus Groups	**Track 1**		**Track 2**		
8:30-10:00 am	Site/Civil	RH 107	8:30-9:30	Cultural Inclusion	Pvy 143
10:00-11:00	Arboretum/Landscape	RH 107			
11:15-12:30	Working Lunch (MGA/Consultant Group/Walsh)	RH 107			
12:30-2:30	Facilities	RH 107			
2:45-4:00 pm	Construction Site Logistics (Rick, Libby, Geoff, Walsh)	RH 107			
Friday, May 13, 2016					
9:00-11:00 am	FSC Decision-Makers - 80% DD Review	Pvy 143			

Workshop 7 is scheduled for June 21 & 22

Schedule is SUBJECT TO CHANGE. Please contact Juliana Ruble for the most recent schedule.