

**PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY
DEPARTMENT OF FOREST ECOSYSTEMS AND SOCIETY**

Contents

FES P&T policies

Appendix I: Minimum Guidelines on Teaching Materials Sent to External Reviewers

Appendix II: Performance Evaluation Guidelines

FES P&T Policies

Initially approved 9/22/10, revised and approved 6/9/2016, revised 5/10/18, approved _____

Background

Decisions about promotion and tenure (P&T) are among the most important ones that we make concerning the faculty of the University. The purpose of this policy statement is to document our intention to help assure consistency in the Department's P&T process. The goal is to achieve a better understanding by our faculty and equity in the decisions we make. This policy statement complements, but does not replace, the policies of either the College or the University.

Policy

The Department adopts the P&T policies of the University and the College with respect to both concept and procedure. These are described in detail in the following documents, all of which are available on line:

- A. Faculty Handbook (<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines>)
- B. College Criteria for P&T (College of Forestry Administrative memo #3), and
- C. Department of Forest Ecosystem and Society Policy on Peer Teaching Reviews

Guiding Principles

Performance evaluations of all kinds are based on an evaluation of accomplishment, within the context of the job assignment. This requires that each faculty member have a position or job description that is accurate and structured in such a way that the responsibilities and expectations of accomplishment that warrant promotion and/or tenure are clear. The position description is dynamic, being modified as needed and its evolution should be documented. It is established at the time of recruitment, is reviewed annually during Annual Professional Reviews (PROF) and with the faculty at the mid-term review. **The goal is to ensure a common understanding among Department Head, candidate, and faculty of the assignment and expected accomplishments for each case being considered.**

It is our intention that the P&T process produces the information needed for making rational, fair, and consistent decisions across cases. Toward this end, the Department solicits information from the candidate, as well as from sources within and outside the Department and University, and invites our faculty to provide information during the discussion of each P&T case.

FES is a diverse department in terms of its faculty's duties, experience, background, and disciplinary expertise. While this poses challenges during P&T evaluations, a guiding principle is that each discipline/field has its own expectations of excellence in terms of research, publications, grants, teaching, and outreach. These differences are to be recognized during the P&T process.

Membership on P&T committees and eligibility to vote on P&T is determined by a person's rank, tenure status, FTE level in the Department and source of salary funds, type of Departmental affiliation, and active participation in the P&T process. These are defined in detail below.

The policy includes an "exceptions process" whereby it is possible for the Departmental P&T Committee to add additional members for the specific discussion of an individual case. One purpose is to be able to include others in the discussion for a specific case when it allows the committee to make a more informed, rational, and fair decision. The policy describes how this process works in the Exceptions section of the Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure. Voting rights are granted to members of the Department only, as defined below.

Confidentiality is essential to the P&T process, but so is transparency. The latter requires that information be shared, while maintaining confidentiality to the degree possible.

Each faculty member voting during the P&T process makes an independent decision: the vote should be informed by discussion with others in the P&T meeting, but each vote is independent.

Definitions and Responsibilities

A. FES P&T Committees

P&T Committees operate at three levels, the Department level, the level of the individual being reviewed, and level of the dossier.

1. **Department Level.** The Departmental P&T Committee is composed of all individuals eligible to vote on any individual P&T case in the Department. Their primary role is to serve as a pool of potential evaluators as well as to develop and implement Departmental P&T policies. All members of the Departmental P&T Committee are allowed to suggest ways the P&T process can be improved and are expected to help assure that the policy is followed. Committee members can only vote on the cases for which they qualify as defined by University and Departmental guidelines (see below).

The Chair(s) of the Departmental P&T Committee manage(s) the P&T process for the faculty of the Department. As with any Chair(s) of a standing or ad hoc Committee, the P&T Chair(s) are appointed by the Department Head. These chairs should have a minimum rank of associate professor with tenure.

2. **Individual Level.** As a practical matter, a separate P&T Voting Committee is formed for each individual being reviewed. Membership on each Voting Committee is determined by the rank, tenure status, and type of appointment of the individual being reviewed. Only faculty eligible to vote on P&T of the individual being reviewed and to sign the letter of evaluation that becomes part of the candidate's dossier are considered members at the individual level. The primary role of this committee is to provide the Department Head with a letter recommending a decision for a particular case.
3. **P&T Dossier Subcommittee.** A P&T Dossier Subcommittee will be appointed by the Department Head for each faculty member being reviewed. The role of this subcommittee is to work with the candidate to develop and understand the dossier, draft an initial letter, give a presentation summarizing the case at the department P&T meeting, and make revisions to the final letter passed on to the Department Head. This Subcommittee will normally consist of three faculty of the Department, although others may be added as needed from outside the Department. The composition of the Subcommittee is critical. If a candidate had a midterm review, members from the Midterm Review Committee will normally be part of the candidate's P&T Dossier Subcommittee (see below). When appropriate, one subcommittee member will be a person who will be considered for promotion within 2-3 years to the same rank as the candidate. A senior faculty member of the Subcommittee will be appointed by the Department Head to Chair the Subcommittee. The primary job of the subcommittee chair is to assure that the dossier, draft letter, and other materials critical for presenting the case at the Departmental P&T meeting are completed in a timely and objective manner. The Department Head will confer with the Chair(s) of the Departmental P&T Committee as well as other discipline-specific colleagues of the candidate in selecting Subcommittee members. After the P&T process, the subcommittee should mentor the candidate as needed to help interpret the outcome of the vote and actions needed, especially if promotion or tenure is denied.

Eligibility for Voting on Individual Cases

To be eligible to vote on a particular case, a faculty member must meet ALL of the following criteria:

1. Have a paid appointment in the Department or an affiliated OSU campus (e.g., Cascades campus) that is at least 0.5 FTE. Extension faculty whose home department is Forest Ecosystems and Society may participate and vote even if they do not receive 0.5 FTE through the Department.
2. Participate in the P&T meeting at which a particular case is discussed. Participation may involve attendance at the meeting or some form of teleconferencing (see below). The discussion associated with each case often provides insights and perspectives essential to the decision-making process. Therefore, participation for the majority of the time when a case is discussed is required.
3. For changes in rank, members must have the same or higher rank as that sought by the candidate. For changes in tenure status, members must be tenured.

Thus, for example, tenured associate professors are members of the P&T Committee and would vote on assistant professors being reviewed for associate professor, regardless of the tenure condition of the candidate. Fixed term (meaning not tenure-track) associate professors are members of the P&T Committee and would vote for faculty being considered for associate professor but would not vote for tenure in any case. Emeritus, adjunct, and courtesy faculty are not eligible to vote on any case, though in certain circumstances they may be included in the presentation and discussion as part of the “exceptions process” described in the Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure section (below).

Remote Voting

While physical attendance of the faculty at the P&T meeting is ideal, it is not always possible. Faculty members unable to physically attend the P&T meeting can apply to the P&T Committee Chairs for a remote ballot. In the application the faculty member should explain the conflict (e.g., a long-scheduled workshop) and agree to teleconference in for the case on which they wish to vote. Because the objective of remote voting is to allow faculty members that have a legitimate conflict to vote, the application must be made at least 2 weeks prior to the meeting. Therefore, this process cannot be used when last minute conflicts arise, except in emergencies.

Midterm P&T Review

Consistent with University and College policy, professorial faculty will have a midterm pre-promotion/tenure review by the P&T Committee which, in this instance, is termed the Midterm Review Committee (see Faculty Handbook <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/policy-mid-term-reviews-tenure-track-faculty>). This review will be early enough in the promotion and/or tenure process to allow for changes as needed to increase the likelihood of success, but normally in the third year of the period in rank. Mid-term evaluations can take place in the Fall or Spring quarters.

Candidates prepare a draft dossier that will be reviewed by the Midterm Review Committee, Department Head, and Dean. The purpose of this review is to (1) familiarize future candidates with the process and expectations, (2) familiarize the College and the Department with the candidate, and (3) accurately identify areas of strength and weakness in a way that will help the candidate enhance their record of accomplishment.

The composition of the Midterm Review Dossier Subcommittee mirrors the composition of the future P&T Dossier Subcommittee in terms of discipline and representation of expertise. Additional members outside of the Department are invited to serve in this capacity as needed. The Midterm Review Process is an analogue to the P&T Review Process in terms of rigor, thoroughness, and completeness except that external reviewers are typically not used (i.e., unless expertise does not exist on campus). This includes review of the candidate's job description and modification as needed via consultation with the Midterm Review Committee. The Midterm Review Dossier Subcommittee prepares a letter for the Department Head and leads a discussion at the full P&T Committee meeting. This letter includes specific recommendations for activities by the candidate, and is voted on and signed by the appropriate faculty. The intent is NOT to provide a binding contract between the faculty and the candidate but rather to provide a measure of the opinion of the Departmental faculty.

Process for Considering Promotion and/or Tenure Cases

The evaluation process is initiated either at the request of the individual coming up for promotion and/or tenure, or the Department Head. As far as the Department is concerned, the process starts in early summer (i.e., July) and ends at the start of the new calendar year (i.e., January). The following is a description of the basic steps:

- A. Candidates are identified by the Department Head and eligible faculty. The list of potential candidates includes all regular faculty as well as courtesy faculty eligible for promotion. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must notify the Department Head of their intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure by March 1. External reviewers must be identified by the end of June. The task of dossier preparation needs to be completed by the end of July, and the dossier should be finalized by September 15th.
- B. The Department Head announces the date of the Departmental P&T Committee Meeting so as to maximize faculty attendance and participation. Typically, this date falls mid to late November. A list of faculty eligible to vote on each case is created. All voting and participating faculty are strongly encouraged to reserve these dates to ensure full participation

in the P&T meeting discussions. Adequate time will be allocated for careful consideration of each case.

- C. The Department Head consults with the Chair(s) of the Departmental P&T Committee and verifies the composition of the P&T Dossier Subcommittee for each individual to be reviewed. The Department Head then appoints the members of these subcommittees.
- D. Draft dossier (see University dossier guidelines at <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dossier>) and teaching materials (see Appendix I) are prepared by the candidate and critically reviewed by the Departmental Head and P&T Dossier Subcommittee for content and structure. Outputs and impacts of the candidate's efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity will be included in promotion and tenure dossiers. Vigorous efforts should be made by the Department Head and P&T Dossier subcommittee at this time to uncover critical issues that could affect P&T votes (e.g., questions about significance and quality of publications, the Candidate's contributions to collaborative proposals, interpretation of teaching scores, outreach efforts, service roles, etc.). These should be brought to the attention of the candidate so they can revise their dossier appropriately. The final dossier is submitted to the Department Head.
- E. The candidate and Dossier Subcommittee suggest potential external reviewers. The Department Head may solicit additional suggestions from Departmental faculty or experts in the areas of expertise of the candidate. External reviewers for professorial faculty will represent national and international specialists in areas related to the candidate's expertise and instruction. Those for senior faculty research assistant I and II will represent those with first-hand knowledge of performance and contributions (e.g., collaborators), those for instructor will represent those specializing in education, and those for extension public outreach and education. In addition to external letters for senior faculty research assistant I and II, a nomination letter from the supervisor(s) is strongly encouraged.
- E. Dossier and teaching materials are finalized and reformatted by the candidate. Departmental staff upload the formatted documents to the university's site. The candidate accepts or declines the waiver of right to see letters of evaluation. The purpose of the waiver is to assure confidentiality to the authors of letters in the belief this will promote honest and frank assessment.
- F. The Department Head solicits letters of evaluation from external peers, as well as from client groups, and a student committee(s) where relevant. Professorial cases require 6 letters minimum, 8 maximum; those for fixed term research assistants require 4 letters, one of which can be from the supervisor in the form of a recommendation outlining why the candidate warrants promotion. The proportion of external peers selected by the Department Head and the candidate will follow University guidelines.

As appropriate to the individual case, the following materials are sent in the review package:

1. A letter from Department Head requesting the review with specific instructions about the focus of the review and the timeline for the response. For all professorial faculty and research associates, letters will emphasize the assignment and any unusual aspects of it,

and ask reviewers to (1) critically address the significance and quality of accomplishments in research, advising, and/or teaching, service, and outreach/extension; (2) assess whether the candidate would be promoted to a comparable level or granted tenure at their institution; (3) discuss areas in need of improvement as well as strengths; and (4) where appropriate evaluate evidence of the candidate's intellectual contribution within their field.

2. The dossier and signed position description (including a clear description of the assignment and how it has changed over time).
 3. For professorial faculty: Copies of the 3-5 most significant publications or other examples of documented accomplishment selected by the candidate and copies of any publications currently "accepted for publication or in press" and therefore not generally available. Publications in process (i.e., not yet accepted for publication) are not normally included in the dossier or sent to reviewers.
 4. Teaching materials that should be consistent with those specified in the Department's "Guidelines for Peer Teaching Review" and Appendix A. These materials do not, however, include peer evaluation of teaching reports.
- G. When the external letters of evaluation are received and the Department Head will seek clarification from the referee on behalf of the candidate when necessary. These letters will be sent to the Chairs of the Departmental P&T Committee and to the P&T Dossier Subcommittee for that individual. Also included are previous and current position descriptions, and any additional information needed for a thorough and equitable evaluation.
- H. Any serious questions brought up by external reviewers (i.e., those that could affect P&T decisions) should be brought to the attention of the candidate (while preserving confidentiality of their source as required) by the Dossier Subcommittee Chair so the candidate can respond, preferably in writing, as far in advance of the P&T meeting as possible. This response is not part of the dossier *per se*, but it will be available to help the P&T committee for a candidate understand the issues involved in these different perspectives.
- I. The dossier is made available for review by the relevant P&T Voting Committee electronically and in paper copy at least one week before the P&T meeting. External letters will only be made available to those able to vote on a case. Upon request, copies are sent to absent P&T Voting Committee members (e.g., those on sabbatical leave) for review and comment. The files are confidential, and those using them are required to protect their confidential nature.
- J. The Dossier subcommittee drafts a letter summarizing the candidate's case. The purpose of the letter is to review the candidate's achievements for each area in their position description and to compare these to the criteria for promotion and tenure as specified in the P&T guidelines.

Departmental P&T Committee Meeting

Independent of the Department Head, the Departmental P&T Committee meets to review each case. Participation in the meeting is one of the voting prerequisites. The Department Office Manager (or designate) will attend the meeting to assist in logistics but is not a voting member of any individual's P&T Committee. Exceptions may be granted for others (see below) that can significantly contribute to the presentation and discussion.

Only those faculty able to vote on a particular case or those granted an exception will be present when that case is presented and discussed.

Conflicts of interest will be identified by the P&T Voting Committee before individual cases are discussed and resolved following University Guidelines (<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines>).

During the meeting, the P&T Dossier Subcommittee Chair for each case will report its findings to the entire P&T Voting Committee and share their draft letter to the Department Head for the case. The Dossier Subcommittee presentation will include a review of the specific criteria for promotion or tenure being considered and an assessment of the candidate's record with respect to these criteria. When courtesy faculty with rank are being considered for promotion, the P&T Dossier subcommittee will review their level of activity in the Department, as well as their record of academic accomplishments, to ensure an appropriate level of activity has been maintained.

After the presentation by the subcommittee, the Chair(s) of the P&T Committee will coordinate the discussions. The main purpose of the P&T process is evaluation. To ensure the frank and candid discussions that are essential in these deliberations, the discussions will be held in a closed, confidential session. The Chair(s) of the P&T committee should not allow discussions of personal characteristics (e.g., race, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, gender, age, and marital or immigration status, etc.) that do not directly relate to interpretation of performance measures, nor of the consequences of promotion (or not) for personal matters. The focus of the P&T Voting committee discussion should be on whether performance is at the level expected for the proposed rank or tenure status.

When the majority of the P&T Voting Committee members are satisfied they understand the case well enough to conduct a vote, a ballot will be distributed to those eligible to vote. If the majority of members of the P&T Voting Committee feel that additional time is required to resolve issues related to the case, then an additional meeting will be arranged. The vote will be tallied and is considered final. Therefore, the P&T Voting Committee may discuss changes in the letter, the nature of advice to the candidate, etc. but not whether a new vote should be taken.

The Chair(s) of the P&T Committee will supervise the voting, which will be by secret, written ballot. At the meeting, preprinted ballots will be distributed for each vote. Only the correct number of ballots for each case will be distributed and all the names of voting members will be recorded so that the composition of the Voting Subcommittee is known. Those having received permission for remote voting may also vote at this time by communicating with the Departmental staff designate. Votes are allowed as Yes, No, and Abstain. For abstention votes, a brief explanation is requested on the ballot to aid the P&T Chairs in interpreting the results for the

candidate and Department Head. Likewise, for negative votes where no significant negative considerations were voiced during the discussion or in the P&T Voting Committee letter, a brief written explanation is requested. If desired, the explanations can be submitted to the P&T Committee Chairs within 2 days after the meeting. However, participants are strongly urged to air any negative sentiments or reservations during the P&T meeting itself so that they can be considered and discussed by the entire P&T Voting Committee.

The results of the meeting, including a synopsis of the discussion of the case and the specific results of voting, are reported in a letter to the Department Head in which strengths as well as the weaknesses of each candidate are represented. The letter is an evaluation of the case and recommendation on promotion and/or tenure, but is not advocacy on behalf of the candidate per se. The Chair of each P&T Dossier Subcommittee supervises the preparation of the letter. It is signed by all members of the P&T Voting Committee and becomes part of the dossier of the candidate, available to the candidate for review. Faculty signatures indicate participation in the evaluation discussion and agreement that the letter is an accurate summary of the discussion, and of the recommendations and conclusions reached. Faculty choosing not to sign the letter are encouraged to submit a dissenting letter to the Department Head explaining their reason for dissent.

The Exception Process

Others not on the P&T Committee with a strong reason to be present (e.g., those having information that would be an asset to the P&T Voting Committee in its deliberations) may also be invited by the Dossier Subcommittee Chair after consultation with the P&T Committee Chair(s). Excepted participants and Dossier Subcommittee members may take part in discussions but voting is reserved for eligible P&T Voting Committee members, as defined above.

At the beginning of the full P&T meeting, the P&T Committee Chair(s) will determine if there are any additional exceptions to be proposed. The exceptions are then justified (verbal or written) and discussed by the P&T Voting Committee for a case in the absence of the person involved. The members of the P&T Voting Committee then vote on each proposed exception. A simple majority approval or tie of those voting is required for approval of an exception.

Conflicts of Interest

To maintain objectivity in the P&T process, it is critical that faculty declare and manage special relationships between candidates and other faculty/administrators that might create real or apparent bias in the process. The overall purpose of this departmental policy is to identify actual and potential conflicts of interest, avoid actual conflicts of interest, and manage potential conflicts in a way that maintains the integrity of the P&T process. It is therefore the responsibility of all P&T Committee members to identify actual and potential conflicts of interest before P&T cases are discussed. Those having a special relationship with a candidate, including those supervised by the candidate, should be forthcoming in making that relationship known and act to ensure that their participation in no way undermines either the objectivity or potential confidentiality of the evaluation process. Academic advisors, and former students as well as those with family or other strong personal relationships will be deemed to have a direct conflict of interest and may not participate in the discussions. Supervisors may participate in preliminary

discussions if invited by the Voting P&T Committee and in the case of FRA promotions are normally expected to provide input via their recommendation letter in which their relationship to the candidate is revealed. Other potential forms of conflicts of interest (e.g., coauthor or frequent collaborator) will be described by those involved and steps will be taken to manage and minimize these conflicts. For example, it may be decided in one case that someone may contribute to the discussion to add perspective, but not vote. Alternatively, in another case it may be decided that there is no real conflict and that voting would not be compromised by their participation.

Subsequent Steps

- A. The signed letter is sent by the P&T Committee to the Department Head.
- B. The Department Head includes his/her own letter of evaluation and recommendation and sends the completed package to the Dean of the College.
- C. The completed package is reviewed by the College P&T Committee, which writes its own letter of evaluation.
- D. Candidates meet with the Dean of the College.
- E. Dossiers are submitted by College to President.
- F. Dean reviews cases with University P&T review team (usually Vice President of Research, Provost, Dean Graduate School, plus others).
- G. Dean, Department Head and Candidate notified.

Election to Membership of College P&T Committee

In keeping with University and College P&T guidelines, two tenured, associate or full professors with at least 0.5 FTE in the College will serve on the College-level P&T Committee. Each will serve for a 3-year period. The election of these members will follow their nomination. Those that have just served a term will not be included in the pool of candidates unless they request otherwise.

Appendix A: Minimum Guidelines on Teaching Materials Sent to External Reviewers

In addition to the list of courses taught, student evaluations, and the candidate statement that are included in the dossier, the following materials will be sent to external reviewers evaluating teaching:

A statement from the candidate describing their teaching philosophy,

Example syllabi from recently taught courses,

Lists of readings for courses,

Example assignments, exams, laboratories, or other significant activities that are evaluated.

Appendix B: Performance Evaluation Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in FES

The following provides guidance as to the kinds of performance that indicate potential for, or achievement of distinction in teaching, advising, research, outreach/extension, and service as well as scholarship and contributions to equity, inclusion, and diversity. There are four significant caveats regarding these guidelines:

- 1) The candidate's position description determines the allocation of effort to each of these criteria and therefore needs to be considered. Therefore, there is no expectation that all candidates will reach similar level of achievement for each criterion.
- 2) These guidelines are not a checklist that guarantees a positive outcome regarding promotion and tenure. There may be other factors that may also influence the outcome of the P&T process such as the candidate statement and external letters.
3. These guidelines provide some but not all possible examples that could lead to a positive outcome. Mentoring is essential to provide candidates a sense of which activities will be viewed as productive investments and which ones will not.
4. The diversity of disciplines and expertise contained within the FES Department means that evaluators must recognize that there are different standards of what constitutes excellence and distinction. The standard to be used is excellence and distinction in the candidate's discipline and area of expertise and not necessarily that of the evaluator's.
5. Because there are many expectations of faculty and each faculty member has different passions and gifts there are many paths toward achievement, excellence, and distinction.

Current specific guidelines

Associate Professor
Professor
Tenure

Evaluation guidelines for all other ranks (Instructors, Faculty Research Assistants and Associates, Professor of Practice, Assistant and Associate Professor Senior Research) can be found at the OSU "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" website - <http://academicaffairs.oregonstate.edu/faculty-handbook/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dossier>

Evaluation Guidelines: Associate Professor

The general criteria for promotion to associate professor include:

Demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, advising/mentoring, service, and other assigned duties consistent with the FTE allocated to these activities;

Achievement in scholarship and creative activity that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for distinction;

An appropriate balance of institutional and professional service as specified by the position description.

The specific categories being examined in promotion include:

Teaching. The teaching category includes instruction as well as efforts to improve teaching (e.g., workshops participated in), and curriculum work (e.g., committee work or course development). In addition to delivering the amount of instruction outlined in the position description, it is expected that all faculty will practice the appropriate delivery methods to achieve a level of student learning consistent with the learning outcomes of the course(s) being offered. The appropriate measure is not necessarily the mechanism of course material delivery per se (e.g., lecture versus discussion versus laboratory). Rather it is the degree the mechanism is appropriate, effective, demonstrates commitment to quality, and facilitates student learning. SET, student, and peer evaluations of teaching provide evidence on the effectiveness of teaching approaches, commitment to quality and potential for distinction in teaching. However, these evaluations need to be placed in the context and nature of the course (e.g. required versus elective), degree of difficulty of course material, and historical expectations for a given course.

Advising/Mentoring. It is expected that faculty will advise/mentor at a level consistent with their FTE allocated to this activity. In addition to documenting the numbers of undergraduate and graduate students (as well as post-doctoral faculty members when appropriate) advised and mentored, evidence demonstrating a commitment to quality advising/mentoring, adequate and timely progress of advisees, active collaborations with advisees as peers that result in scholarly outputs (or other activities such as a workshop) should be considered. Additionally, demonstrated evidence of advising/mentorship beyond graduation and the potential for impact by students on the field can be considered. Evidence for effectiveness and impact of advising/mentoring is documented in part in the student committee letter(s).

Research. The faculty member should be potentially distinctive in at least one identifiable area of expertise in which scholarly and creative activities are achieved. There are three general research criteria to be considered:

1. The research must have **impact** on peers in the field and be part of the development of a field, although it should be recognized that impact can be measured in various ways by various disciplines/fields.

2. Publications and products (e.g., key databases or methods) are a necessary condition for impactful scholarship and is a major indication of academic success. However, the number of publications and products is only one dimension of the faculty member's productivity. Aside from impact, the length, complexity, novelty, and synthetic nature of publications and other products should be considered. The evaluation should not reduce publications to a single form (e.g., standard peer-reviewed journal publications). In contrast it should balance all these dimensions of publications to evaluate the overall level of publication productivity.

3. Grants. All faculty are expected to actively pursue and sustain a credible effort to generate funds necessary to conduct productive research that is consistent with their research FTE allocation. While successful grant proposals should be documented, unfunded proposals can represent a significant and high-quality effort that should be considered. However, grants are a means to an end (e.g., publications and other products with impact). To be fully considered in the evaluation, the faculty member must provide an indication of the quality of proposals (e.g., acceptance or documentation of scores or some other testimony on the quality of the research) and the degree of competitiveness (e.g., percentage of proposals funded).

In evaluating research, it is important to consider the balance between impact, publications, other products, and grants. Evidence for a healthy grant to publications/products relationship is to be considered.

Extension/Outreach. Although many professorial faculty do not have FTE allocated to extension and outreach, there is a general expectation that each faculty member will engage in public outreach and engagement that is consistent with OSU's land grant mission to raise public awareness and understanding as well as to provide professional expertise. Activities indicating achievement in public outreach could include science advocacy (as per COF memo #31), such as publicity, public presentations and articles, press releases, interviews, or providing expert opinion.

Service/Mentoring. It is expected that faculty will be full and productive participants in professional and various levels of departmental, college, and university service. Moreover, it is expected that there will be a balance between professional and university service consistent with the faculty member's position description. In addition to listing service contributions, evidence for specific achievements is essential to assess this criterion (e.g., number of manuscript reviews, research panels, grant reviews, key policy or other committee contributions such hiring key faculty, evaluating faculty).

Administration. For faculty members who have administration as part of their FTE, it is expected that entities administered by the faculty member will be run actively, effectively, and productively, as well as within legal and general administrative guidelines of OSU, the COF, and FES. Evidence for productivity would include the entities' collective achievements in teaching, advising/mentoring, research, extension/outreach, and service/mentoring. In evaluating collective productivity, the size of the entity should be considered.

Scholarship and Creative Activity. As indicated by OSU's guidelines, scholarship must be based on a high level of professional expertise of the faculty member; must provide evidence of originality; must be documented and validated as through peer review and/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 considered scholarship as long as it meets these criteria. It is expected that the faculty member be potentially distinctive in at least one identifiable area of expertise.

Collegiality. Collegiality is important for the effective governance and functioning of academic units including FES. It is expected that all faculty will be full, active, and constructive participants/citizens in their departmental activities.

Contributions to equity, inclusion, and diversity. It is expected that each faculty member will define their responsibility in their position description, develop a personal plan (ideally a written one), discuss this plan and progress with their supervisor during Annual Professional Reviews, and document progress in achieving their plan's goals. Given that there are many ways in which positive contributions can be made depending on the faculty member and opportunities that arise, it is essential that each faculty member explain their contributions. It is recognized that not all attempts at contributions will prove fruitful; therefore, effort as well as achievement should be considered.

Evaluation Guidelines: Professor

The general criteria for promotion to professor include:

Distinction in teaching, advising, service, or other assigned duties, as evident in continuing development and sustained effectiveness in these areas, new and innovative teaching, curricular development, awards and recognition;

Distinction in scholarship, as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession;

Exemplary institutional and professional service, and an appropriate balance between the two.

The specific categories being examined in promotion include:

Teaching. The teaching category includes instruction as well as efforts to improve teaching (e.g., workshops participated in), and curriculum work (e.g., committee work or course development). In addition to delivering the amount of instruction outlined in the position description, it is expected that all faculty will practice the appropriate delivery methods to achieve a level of student learning consistent with the learning outcomes of the course(s) being offered. The appropriate measure is not necessarily the mechanism of course material delivery per se (e.g., lecture versus discussion versus laboratory). Rather it is the degree the mechanism is appropriate, effective, demonstrates commitment to quality, and facilitates student learning. SET, student, and peer evaluations of teaching provide evidence on the effectiveness of teaching approaches, commitment to quality and distinction in teaching. However, these evaluations need to be placed in the context and nature of the course (e.g. required versus elective), degree of difficulty of course material, and historical expectations for a given course. While all professorial faculty are expected to develop and improve the courses they are involved with, at this level distinction would be indicated in leadership and participation in major curriculum development and improvement.

Advising/Mentoring. It is expected that faculty will advise/mentor at a level consistent with their FTE allocated to this activity. In addition to documenting the numbers of undergraduate and graduate students (as well as post-doctoral faculty members when appropriate) advised and mentored, evidence demonstrating a commitment to quality advising/mentoring, adequate and timely progress of advisees, active collaborations with advisees as peers that result in scholarly outputs (or other activities such as a workshop) should be considered. Additionally, demonstrated evidence of advising/mentorship beyond graduation and the potential for impact by students on the field should be considered. Evidence for effectiveness and impact of advising/mentoring is documented in part in the student committee letter(s).

Research. The faculty member should have achieved distinction in at least one identifiable area of expertise in which scholarly and creative activities are achieved. There are three general research criteria to be considered:

1. The research must have distinctive **impact** on peers in the field and development of a field, although it should be recognized that impact can be measured in various ways by various

disciplines. Evidence of having achieved impact and hence distinction would include invitations to present at national and international meeting, conferences, or workshops, participation in key synthesis efforts including commentaries, book chapters, and books.

2. Publications and products (e.g., key databases or methods) are a necessary condition for impactful scholarship and is a major indication of academic success. However, the number of publications and products is only one dimension of the faculty member's productivity. Aside from impact, the length, complexity, novelty, and synthetic nature of publications and other products should be considered. As the latter is a major factor in demonstrating leadership and distinction in a field, it provides important evidence supporting promotion to the level of professor. The evaluation should not reduce publications to a single form (e.g., standard peer-reviewed journal publications). In contrast it should balance all these dimensions of publications to evaluate the overall level of publication productivity.

3. Grants. All faculty are expected to actively pursue and sustain a credible effort to generate funds necessary to conduct productive research that is consistent with their research FTE allocation. While successful grant proposals should be documented, unfunded proposals can represent a significant and high-quality effort that should be considered. However, grants are a means to an end (e.g., publications and other products with impact). To be fully considered in the evaluation, the faculty member must provide an indication of the quality of proposals (acceptance or documentation of scores or some other testimony on the quality of the research) and the degree of competitiveness (e.g., percentage of proposals funded). At this level, the ratio of funded to unfunded proposals would be expected to increase relative to that of associate professor, although this index needs to be placed in the context of the discipline/field.

In evaluating research, it is important to consider the balance between impact, publications, other products, and grants. Evidence for a healthy grant to publications/products relationship is to be considered (e.g., grants without products at this level would not be expected).

Extension/Outreach. Although many professorial faculty do not have FTE allocated to extension and outreach, there is a general expectation that each faculty member will engage in public outreach and engagement that is consistent with OSU's land grant mission to raise public awareness and understanding as well as to provide professional expertise. Activities indicating achievement in public outreach could include science advocacy (as per COF memo #31), such as publicity, public presentations and articles, press releases, interviews, or providing expert opinion.

Service/Mentoring. It is expected that faculty will be full and productive participants in professional and various levels of departmental, college, and university service. Moreover, it is expected that there will be a balance between professional and university service consistent with the faculty member's position description. In addition to listing service contributions, evidence for specific achievements is essential to assess this criterion (e.g., number of manuscript reviews, research panels, grant reviews, key policy or other committee contributions such hiring key faculty, evaluating faculty). There is an expectation at this level that the candidate would have led and chaired committees at the departmental level and have participated in college and university committees/governance. In addition, participation in journal editorial functions (editorships, advisory boards) and proposal review panels would be viewed as evidence of distinction.

Administration. For faculty members who have administration as part of their FTE, it is expected that entities administered by the faculty member will be run actively, effectively, and productively, as well as within legal and general administrative guidelines of OSU, the COF, and FES. Evidence for productivity would include the entities collective achievements in teaching, advising/mentoring, research, extension/outreach, and service/mentoring. In evaluating collective productivity, the size of the entity should be considered.

Scholarship and Creative Activity. As indicated by OSU's guidelines, scholarship must be based on a high level of professional expertise of the faculty member; must give evidence of originality; must be documented and validated as through peer review and/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 considered scholarship as long as it meets these criteria. It is expected that the faculty member has achieved distinction in at least one identifiable area of expertise.

Collegiality. Collegiality is important for the effective governance and functioning of academic units including FES. It is expected that all faculty will be full, active, and constructive participants/citizens in their departmental activities. At this level there is an expectation of leadership in these activities given the seniority of the candidates.

Contributions to equity, inclusion, and diversity. It is expected that each faculty member will define their responsibility in their position description, develop a personal plan (ideally a written one), discuss this plan and progress with their supervisor during Annual Professional Reviews, and to document progress in achieving their plan's goals. Given that there are many ways in which positive contributions can be made depending on the faculty member and opportunities that arise it is essential that each faculty member explain their contributions. It is recognized that not all attempts at contributions will prove fruitful; therefore, effort as well as achievement should be considered.

Evaluation Guidelines: Tenure

Tenure is granted to faculty members whose character, achievements in serving the University's missions, and potential for effective long-term performance warrant the institution's reciprocal long-term commitment.

Although promotion and tenure are separate decisions, they are often related. To warrant tenure the candidate must exhibit a level of performance and accomplishment either consistent with promotion to academic ranks granted tenure (e.g., associate professor) or their current academic rank if promotion is not possible (e.g., full professor).

Specific evaluation considerations include:

1. Candidates recommended for tenure should have achievements that enhance the reputation, capabilities, and performance of the University in carrying out its missions. Typically, these are expressed as contributions to teaching, advising, research, outreach/extension, external service and scholarship as well as areas of expertise important to the University.
2. A degree of collegiality that demonstrates a willingness to invest in the Department, College, and University to improve its governance, general administration, and function. Typically, these are expressed as contributions to internal service, administration, mentoring, and to increasing equity, inclusion, and diversity.
3. A record indicating a steady to increasing level of involvement and accomplishment. It is realized that candidates have limited time and resources and that involvement and accomplishments vary from year to year. However, steady decline in involvement and accomplishments or a significant imbalance in the two would weaken a candidate's case for tenure.