

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

- [General Purposes and Responsibilities](#)
- [Criteria for Promotion and Tenure](#)
- [Faculty Dossiers](#)
- [Procedural Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure](#)
- [Waiver of Access to Submitted Evaluation Materials from Reviewer](#)
- [Dossier Guidelines](#)
- [Policy on Salary Increases for Promotion in Rank](#)
- [Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Appointments and Promotion](#)

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

GENERAL PURPOSES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The quality of Oregon State University is sustained through the dedicated and creative work of the faculty. Objective, systematic, and thorough appraisal of each candidate for initial and continued appointment, for promotion in academic rank, and for the granting of indefinite tenure is therefore important. The purpose of these guidelines is to provide common criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion for all Oregon State University faculty in the professorial ranks. Guidelines for promoting instructors, research assistants, and faculty with courtesy or research appointments are included with these criteria.

Promotions in rank and the granting of tenure are based on merit. They are never automatic or routine, and are made without regard to race, color, religion, gender, age, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, political affiliation, or national origin. In general, promotions are awarded to recognize the level of faculty members' contributions to the missions of the University in teaching, advising, service, and other assignments; and in scholarship and creative activity.

Responsibility for promotion and tenure recommendations rests principally with the senior members of the faculty, unit administrators, and academic deans. Final responsibility rests with the Provost and Executive Vice President. Reviewers base their recommendations on carefully prepared dossiers that document and evaluate the accomplishments of each candidate measured relative to the duties of each individual as enumerated in their position description.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Candidates for promotion and tenure will be evaluated objectively for evidence of excellence in their performance of assigned duties and in their scholarship or creative activity. Each of these responsibilities will be documented in the dossier.

Oregon State University is committed to educating, both on and off campus, the citizens of Oregon, the nation, and the international community, and in expanding and applying knowledge. The responsibilities of individual faculty in relation to these fundamental commitments will vary and will be specified in his or her individualized position description. Whatever the assignment, faculty in the professorial ranks will engage in appropriate scholarship and other creative activity, with a minimum of 15% FTE allocated to this.

All faculty are expected to be collegial members of their units, and to perform appropriate service that contributes to the effectiveness of their departments, colleges, and the University,

and of their professions. Relative contributions expected in the various areas of responsibility will depend on the faculty member's assignment.

Faculty Responsibilities

A faculty member's responsibilities may be subdivided into the categories of teaching and advising, research, extension, service, and other duties as assigned. In addition, faculty are expected to produce scholarly outcomes, as described in their position description. A general description of assigned duties and scholarship expectations follows. The position description is where more specific expectations are enumerated and form the basis for evaluation (see the University's Guidelines for Position Descriptions for Academic Employees).

Assigned Duties

Teaching: The teaching of students is central to the mission of Oregon State University. Most faculty have significant responsibilities in instruction:

- in presenting resident credit courses, international programs, for-credit distance learning programs;
- in directing undergraduate and graduate research or projects, internships, and theses, and serving on master and doctoral committees;
- in collaborating with and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral associates.

When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Faculty with responsibilities in instruction can be promoted and tenured only when there is clear documentation of effective performance in the teaching role.

Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students. Other activities that provide evidence of a faculty member's particular commitment to effective teaching include:

- contribution in curricular development, including collaborative courses and programs;
- innovation in teaching strategies, including the incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning;
- documented study of curricular and pedagogical issues, and incorporation of this information into the classroom.

Evaluation of instruction is based on a combination of systematic and on-going peer evaluations, following unit guidelines for peer review of teaching; tabulated responses from learners or participants of courses taught by the candidate; and evaluation, by student

representatives, of materials that pertain to teaching. Peer evaluations should be based both on classroom observations and on review of course syllabi, texts, assigned reading, examinations, and class materials. Where possible, evaluation is enhanced by evidence of student learning.

Advising

All faculty members must also be committed to the well-being of students, both inside and outside the classroom. Effective advising helps create an environment which fosters student learning and student retention. The formal and informal advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students is an indispensable component of the broader educational experience at the University.

Faculty advising may take the form of assisting students in the selection of courses or careers, serving as faculty adviser with student groups, assisting learners in educational programs both on and off campus, and mentoring students. For promotion and tenure, performance in such activities must be documented and evaluated. Documentation should include the number of students served and the advising or mentoring services provided. 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.

Research

Research is the active pursuit of new ideas and knowledge. Research may add to our theoretical understanding of an area or may focus on the improved application of existing knowledge or methods. Scholarship related research results are demonstrated by characteristics such as peer review affirmation (see below). However, there are other outcomes of research activities that should be accommodated accurately in our system.

Many faculty in technical fields are expected to participate actively in research. The exact definition of research for the purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, however, is discipline-specific. Thus, research may also include interpretation and application of new ideas or new methods that may have outcomes that are not peer reviewed but are consistent with the goals of the research project. Expectations and outcomes should be clearly understood by faculty within their specific discipline and delineated in faculty position descriptions, including the proportion of their research activities that are expected to have (or not to have) scholarship as outcomes.

Extension

In general, extension is the informal education (non-credit) that is conducted by faculty members in response to specific needs of client groups in a particular geographic area or a group with common interests. It incorporates a learning process specifically designed for the audience and promotes learning by, from, and with client groups. Extension also seeks to integrate education with research activities and frequently engages volunteers who extend the effectiveness of extension programs. Extension programming often includes non-credit seminars, workshops, continuing-education and distance-learning programs (including E-campus), camps, free-choice learning, and field days.

Evaluation of extension education is based on a combination of systematic and ongoing peer evaluations, following unit guidelines for peer review of teaching/extension, and tabulated responses from participants. Peer evaluations should be based both on observations from classes taught and on review of teaching materials. Where possible, evaluation is enhanced by evidence of student learning. When extension is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness in extension teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Faculty with responsibilities in extension can be promoted and tenured only when there is clear documentation of effective performance and impact in this aspect of the extension role.

Service

Faculty service is essential to the University's success in serving its central missions, and is a responsibility of all faculty. Faculty will be held accountable for that responsibility, and rewarded for their contribution according to specific expectations laid out in their position descriptions. As with other duties, the FTE ascribed to service in the position description should be an accurate representation of the time assigned to the activity.

Faculty members perform a broad array of services that are vital to supporting and sustaining the quality and effectiveness of the University and its programs (institutional service), and to their disciplines (professional service). Faculty members are expected to provide service to the University, its students, clients, and programs, as collegial and constructive members of the University and the broader community. Examples include service in faculty governance; in academic and student-support units; in international development; in community and state programs; in mentoring students and student groups; and on department, college, and university committees.

Service to professional organizations contributes to the national and international intellectual communities of which OSU is a part. The part of faculty members' service duties that draw upon their professional expertise and/or are relevant to their assignment, may be considered as a component of a faculty member's scholarship or creative activity, if the work meets the

standard criteria of peer validation and dissemination. The appropriate designation of each service duty should be discussed with the individual's supervisor prior to taking on the duty.

Many faculty make important service contributions to university relations or to the community that are not directly related to their appointments. Though valuable in their own right, and ideally a responsibility of all citizens, these efforts are considered in promotion and tenure decisions only to the extent that they contribute to the mission of the University.

Other Assignments

These may include but are not restricted to the following: Counseling, Academic Administration, International Assignments, Information Services, Libraries, Diagnostic and Analytical Facilitation, and Student Services. Generally, these assignments:

- Involve discipline specific work for which the faculty member was hired
- Requires expertise and training at the faculty level
- Are done at the behest of others
- Will vary, depending on the specific assignment, in the degree to which they produce scholarly or creative outcomes directly attributable to the faculty member.

The specific expectations (e.g. for scholarship) of these assignments must be described in the individualized position description.

Where faculty assignments entail serving students or clients, evaluation will focus on the quality of the specific services provided, determined by the purposes of the service and the faculty member's success in achieving them. Documentation should include the number of students or clients served and the services provided. Evaluation will consider innovation and creativity, and evidence of effectiveness; and may be based on systematic surveys of, and assessments by, those who received the services, when signed by the evaluators.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

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

peers in journals, in formal peer-reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer-evaluated forums.

Scholarship and creative activity derive from many activities, including but not limited to:

- research contributing to a body of knowledge;
- development of new technologies, materials, methods, or educational approaches;
- integration of knowledge or technology leading to new interpretations or applications;
- creation and interpretation in the arts, including the performing arts;
- work on steering committees, funding agency panels and editorships where the outcome is a fundamental change in the field's direction.

While the kinds of scholarship for faculty across the range of positions at the University will vary, the requirement that the significance of the scholarship be validated and be communicated to publics beyond the University will sustain a uniformly high standard. In some fields, refereed journals and monographs are the traditional media for communication and peer validation; in others, exhibitions and performances. In still other fields, emerging technologies are creating, and will continue to create, entirely new media and methods. In consideration for promotion and tenure, scholarship and creative activity are not merely to be enumerated but are to be carefully, objectively, and rigorously evaluated by professional peers, including ones external to the University.

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.

In certain positions, seeking competitive grants and contracts is an essential responsibility, and success in this endeavor—particularly when the grants are highly competitive and peer-reviewed— is a component of achievement in scholarship.

Criteria for Granting Indefinite Tenure

Tenure ensures the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the free search for knowledge and the attainment of excellence in the University. But in addition, tenure also reflects and recognizes a candidate's potential long-term value to the institution, as evidenced by professional performance and growth. Tenure sets universities apart from other institutions. Faculty are not merely employed by the University but are integral to the educational and research programs of the University; tenured faculty are the community of educators who create institutional stability and an ongoing commitment to excellence. Tenure, therefore, will be 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. The granting of tenure is more significant than promotion in academic rank.

Tenure is granted for achievement, not for years in rank, but under normal circumstances faculty will be considered for tenure in their sixth year of service in professorial rank. By the end of the sixth year on tenure track ("annual tenure"), the faculty member must be granted indefinite tenure or be given a year's timely notice that the appointment will not be continued. A faculty member who works less than 1.0 FTE may have his or her tenure clock adjusted in accordance with the rules of the State Board of Higher Education (see OAR 580-021-0125). The tenure clock will begin on the September 16th following the faculty member's hire, unless otherwise stipulated in the offer letter. The number of years of credit for prior service (if any) must be stated in the offer letter, along with the date by which tenure must be granted. Under extenuating circumstances, such as personal or family illness, a faculty member can request of the Provost and Executive Vice President that the tenure clock be extended. A one-year extension will be granted for leave taken under the Family and Medical Leave Act that extends for 3 months or more. Requests for extension of the tenure clock should come at the time of the extenuating circumstances, and will not be accepted after June 1 of the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the tenure decision will be made.

The tenure decision is based primarily on the candidate's performance of teaching, advising, service, and other assignments and achievements in scholarship. In judging the suitability of the candidate for indefinite tenure, however, it is also appropriate to consider collegiality, professional integrity, and willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments.

Criteria for Promotions

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon evidence of the candidate's:

- demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, advising, service, and other assigned duties;
- achievement in scholarship and creative activity that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for distinction;
- appropriate balance of institutional and professional service.

Promotion to Associate Professor does not automatically grant tenure. Tenure will usually accompany a promotion, but the decision on tenure is made independently of the decision on promotion.

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon evidence of the candidate's:

- 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.

Criteria for Promotion of Clinical, Research, Fixed Term Extension and Courtesy Faculty

Faculty with clinical, senior research, fixed term extension and courtesy appointments will be expected to meet the same criteria for advancement in professorial rank as those with regular appointments. Given the nature of the appointments, commitments in some areas of responsibility may be greater than in others, but the criteria for scholarship will adhere to the same standard expected of faculty with regular appointments. Additional background information on clinical faculty are available at Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Appointments and Promotion.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of Instructors

Promotion from the rank of Instructor to Senior Instructor may be considered after four years of full-time service, calculated from the hire date to December 31 of the calendar year prior to the promotion decision (promotion decisions are made in June of the following year). For fixed term instructors with extended prior service, promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor cannot be made effective before the end of the third year of full-time service. To be promoted, a candidate must:

- have a graduate degree appropriate to the assigned duties, or comparable educational or professional experience;
- have special skills or experience needed in the unit;
- have an exceptional record of achievement in the assigned duties.

The criteria for Teaching, Advising, and Other Assignments in this document can provide guidelines for documenting and evaluating the level of achievement. Promotions cannot be made from non-professorial to professorial ranks.

Tenure-track Instructors

A tenure-track Instructor position is defined by teaching, advising and other assigned duties as delineated in the position description, and has a focus on a specialized assignment within an academic program. Such positions carry an expectation of scholarship as defined in the position

description. Faculty in such positions are expected to demonstrate their potential for long-term contribution to the institution.

Only those instructors hired into tenure-track positions are eligible for tenure. Tenure-track instructors must hold a minimum of a Master's degree. Promotion and tenure of tenure-track instructors shall be governed by the promotion and tenure process and guidelines. This means that a tenure-track instructor, under normal circumstances, will be considered for tenure in their sixth year of service. By the end of the sixth year, a tenure-track instructor must be granted indefinite tenure or be given a year's timely notice that the appointment will not be renewed. Instructors in tenure-track positions who have extended prior service as fixed term instructors may have credit for prior service specified in their offer letter, but will not be eligible for tenure before they have completed three years of tenure-track status.

Criteria for Promotion of Faculty Research Assistants

Faculty with non-professorial rank are hired in positions to meet units' specific needs. Criteria for promotion will therefore be specific to the candidate's position description.

Promotion from Faculty Research Assistant to Senior Faculty Research Assistant may be considered after four years of full-time service, calculated from the hire date to December 31 of the calendar year prior to the promotion decision (promotion decisions are made in June of the following year). For Faculty Research Assistants with extended prior service, promotion to the rank of Senior Faculty Research Assistant cannot be made effective before the end of the third year of full-time service. To be promoted, a candidate must:

- have a graduate degree appropriate to the field in which the research activities are performed, or comparable educational or professional experience;
- demonstrate a high level of competence, achievement, and potential in research, or serve effectively in a position requiring high individual responsibility or special professional expertise;
- demonstrate a high degree of initiative in research and leadership among research colleagues in the department, as documented in authorship, management responsibilities, and creative approaches to research.

FACULTY DOSSIERS

Compilation of the Dossier

Promotion and tenure decisions are based primarily on an evaluation of the faculty member's achievements as described in his or her dossier. The dossier must document and contain evaluation of the candidate's performance in teaching, advising, service, or other assignments;

and in scholarship, consistent with the candidate's position. Copies of the current Dossier Preparation Guidelines and models for requesting letters of evaluation can be obtained from the Office of Academic Affairs.

Although the candidate prepares much of the material for the dossier, the immediate supervisor of the tenure unit (department chair or head, county staff chair, dean or director) will assure that the candidate receives assistance as needed, and will be responsible for seeing that the final dossier is complete and conforms to University guidelines.

Recommendations for the promotion or tenure of a unit supervisor will be reviewed in the same manner as for other faculty, except that the dean or director to whom the supervisor reports will appoint a senior faculty member to assume the supervisor's usual responsibilities.

Access to the Dossier and University Files by the Faculty Member

As described in the OSU Faculty Records Policy contained in the Faculty Handbook, faculty members will be allowed full access to their own dossiers, personnel files, and records kept by the institution, college, or department, except for:

- letters of evaluation submitted as part of a pre-employment review at Oregon State University;
- solicited letters of evaluation for faculty who have signed voluntary waivers of access to those letters as part of a particular year's promotion and tenure review.

Prior to the dossier receiving its first formal review by the department P&T committee, the candidate must sign and date a certification that the open part of the dossier is complete. Should the candidate and the supervisor of the tenure unit disagree on the inclusion of some materials, the candidate may indicate his or her objection in the statement of certification. Once the dossier is certified, the only materials to be added subsequently will be the letters of committee and administrative review, and in some cases the candidate's response to an evaluation as described in the following section. If manuscripts are accepted for publication after the dossier is certified, it is the faculty member's responsibility to inform his or her supervisor. That information will then be considered in the review.

Throughout the process of review, the open parts of the dossier remain available to the candidate at his or her request. The candidate will be notified when letters of evaluation by reviewers at the unit and college levels are added to the dossier.

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The process for earning promotion and tenure begins at the time of hiring. Faculty are hired with expectations in job performance and scholarship that are established in position descriptions, which may then be revised as the tenure unit's needs and the faculty member's assignments change. From the time of their arrival at the University, new faculty should be well advised of what is expected of them for promotion and tenure. Reports from the annual Periodic Reviews of Faculty (PROF's) including any more intensive third-year review, while not included in the candidate's dossier for promotion and tenure, are used by supervisors in tenure units to inform faculty, in a constructive way, of their progress toward promotion and tenure.

Declaration and Management of Conflicts of Interest

In order that we maintain objectivity in the promotion and tenure process, it is critical that we declare and manage special relationships between candidates and other faculty/administrators that might create real or apparent bias in the process. This means that evaluators who have a relationship with a candidate should be forthcoming in making that relationship known, consistent with University policies and these Guidelines, and act to insure that their participation in no way undermines the objectivity of the evaluation process. This includes personal relationships as well as professional relationships such as those with former advisees and collaborators. A faculty member or administrator involved in the P&T evaluation process must declare any conflict of interest that arises from these circumstances.

Policy for dealing with conflicts of interest stemming from a personal relationship are covered in both OSU's consensual relations policy (<http://oregonstate.edu/dept/affact/policy/consensual.php>) and in OAR 580-022-0055, which generally prohibits an academic staff member from participating in employment decisions involving the staff member's spouse, child, or stepchild (reference - http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_500/OAR_580/580_022.html).

With respect to professional relationships, if anyone involved in the P&T evaluation process has a professional relationship with a candidate under consideration, he or she must declare the nature of the professional relationship before any discussion takes place. In addition, the specific nature of the relationship should be noted in any written evaluation. If, after consultation, the unit P&T committee chair or the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs feels that the process would be compromised by the participation of any individual, that faculty member must excuse him or herself from any discussion or voting on that particular case.

In some cases, the candidate's supervisor will participate in the preliminary discussions of the unit P&T committee in order to provide information on process prior to deliberations. However, the supervisor may participate only if invited by the unit committee and must not be present

for the deliberations. Supervisors who have a past or current personal or professional relationship with the candidate that might compromise the evaluation process (example: former advisee undergoing evaluation) must either excuse themselves from the process and find a substitute, or state the nature of the relationship at the beginning of the evaluation letter. In no case will they participate in the voting as a member of the committee. This includes cases such as department heads serving on College level P&T committees. In such cases, department heads must excuse themselves from the discussion and voting on any case related to their own department.

Initiation of the Recommendation

Tenure resides in the academic unit, which for most faculty will be the department. Final decisions on promotion and tenure are made by the Provost and Executive Vice President, but the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's performance and recommending promotion and tenure actions rests in the tenure unit and college. The supervisor of the tenure unit or a committee of faculty assigned this responsibility, in consultation with the candidate, will normally initiate the candidate's review for promotion and tenure. The supervisor of the tenure unit will also work in cooperation with any other supervisors to whom the faculty member reports. The candidate, however, always has the right to initiate the review. In either case, a complete dossier will be compiled.

Tenure Unit Review and Recommendation

In all but rare cases, the supervisor of the tenure unit and a promotion and tenure review committee formed from among the faculty within the unit (at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered). The supervisor and the promotion and tenure review committee will each independently evaluate the materials in the dossier, and recommend either for or against the candidate's promotion or tenure. If there are not enough faculty of the appropriate rank within the unit (there should be at least three on the committee), the supervisor can invite faculty from outside the unit to serve as voting members on the committee. Retired faculty (even those on 1040 assignments) are not eligible to vote at the tenure unit level. If the individual serving in the department chair/head role is on a 1040 assignment, he/she can write the supervisor's letter of evaluation. Committees may include faculty at all ranks who can contribute to the discussion, but not every committee member may be eligible to vote. For fixed-term candidates being considered for promotion, only faculty members above the current rank of the candidate may vote. For tenured candidates being considered for promotion or untenured candidates being considered for both promotion and tenure, only tenured faculty members above the current rank of the candidate may vote. For untenured candidates being considered solely for tenure, only tenured faculty members at or above the current rank of the candidate may vote.

The supervisor will also consult the candidate's personnel file maintained in the unit. In the supervisor's letter of evaluation, he or she will comment on any information in that file that is relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties, scholarship, collegiality, professional integrity, or willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments.

If both the supervisor's and the committee's recommendations are negative, the dossier will not be forwarded to the next level of review, unless the candidate, following discussion with the supervisor, insists, or the candidate is in the final year of annual tenure. In such cases the dossier must be forwarded for consideration, unless the candidate submits a letter of resignation.

The letters from the supervisor and the promotion and tenure review committee 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 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.

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. 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 process outlined in section VI of the dossier guidelines <http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/dosguide.html>.

Faculty with teaching and/or Extension/outreach assignments should have a letter from their peer teaching review committee that summarizes all peer teaching reviews over the evaluation timeframe.

Prior to the dossier leaving the unit, the supervisor will meet with the candidate to share the outcomes of the unit reviews. The candidate may add a written statement regarding these reviews, to be included in the dossier. In addition, at any time during the review process the candidate may withdraw his or her dossier.

College Review and Recommendation

The candidate's dossier—including the letters of evaluation and recommendation from the supervisor, the faculty committee, and the student or client representatives; together with the candidate's response to the departmental evaluation when one is added—is forwarded for

review at the college level. The college review should ensure that each dossier has been carefully and properly prepared, and that uniform or equivalent standards are applied to all faculty within the college. Any college processes must be consistent with these procedural guidelines. The reviewers at the college level are to determine whether the letters of evaluation accurately assess the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier. Care should be taken to ensure appropriate and adequate input by faculty throughout the college review process. A letter of evaluation from the dean and a letter of evaluation from the review committee are added to the dossier as it is forwarded for review at the University level. The candidate may add a written statement regarding these reviews, to be included in the dossier.

The reviews of Faculty Research Assistants and Courtesy Faculty going up for promotion will end at the College level. The College is responsible for ensuring that the promotion and tenure guidelines and procedures are followed and for reporting results of Faculty Research Assistants and Courtesy faculty promotions to Academic Affairs.

University Review and Recommendation

Each dossier will be reviewed for completeness by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs. Where additional information is needed, the candidate's supervisor or dean will be contacted.

Completed dossiers that have received uniformly positive recommendations at the previous levels of review will be forwarded to the Provost and Executive Vice President, who will assure that University-wide standards have been met. In reaching a final decision, the Provost and Executive Vice President may confer with others as appropriate. All dossiers that have received mixed recommendations at the unit or college level will be reviewed by the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee, which is chaired by the Provost and Executive Vice President and consists of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs, the Vice President for Research, the Vice Provost for Outreach and Engagement, and the Dean of the Graduate School.

The purpose of the University review is to ensure that all faculty are held to common standards, and to resolve disagreements in previous recommendations. In cases in which the members of the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee are divided over the final recommendation, or in which their recommendation differs from those of the college or unit, the candidate's dean and supervisor will be invited for discussion.

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee will have access to all dossiers under consideration, and representatives of the committee will observe the deliberations of the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee on cases where clarification or

discussion with deans and/or supervisors takes place, to ensure an equitable process for all faculty.

Decisions and Appeals

When all necessary reviews and discussions have been completed, the Provost and Executive Vice President will make the final decision. Candidates will be informed of the decision in writing. In the case of a negative decision, the basis for the denial will be stated, along with information on the right to appeal.

Faculty not approved for promotion or tenure by the Provost and Executive Vice President may appeal to the President within two weeks of receipt of the letter announcing the decision. Extenuating circumstances, procedural irregularities that were not considered by the Provost and Executive Vice President, and factual errors in the evaluations are grounds for appeal. When appealing, the candidate should write a letter to the President stating which of the above criteria for appeal applies, and stating the facts that support the appeal. No other supporting letters will be considered. The President has the right to request additional information.

Return of Dossiers

After the institutional review is finished, the complete dossier is retained temporarily in the Office of Academic Affairs. The dossier is subsequently returned to the appropriate dean, typically at the start of the next academic year. The dean will then return it to the tenure unit, where, after confidential letters have been removed, the dossier is retained as part of the faculty member's personnel files.

Guidelines approved 1995, Revised August 2007.

Waiver of Access to Submitted Evaluation Materials from Reviewer

WAIVER OF ACCESS

Chapter 317 Oregon Laws 1975 (ORS 351.065) provides that a faculty member shall not be denied full access to his or her personnel file or records kept by the State Board of Higher Education or its institutions, schools, or departments. Oregon Administrative Rule (580-22-075) states that "when evaluating employed faculty members, the Board, its institutions, schools, or departments shall not solicit nor accept letters, documents, or other materials, given orally or in written form, from individuals or groups who wish their identity kept anonymous or the information they provide kept confidential, except for student evaluations made or received pursuant to Rule 580-22-100(5)."

All faculty members, therefore, have a right to view any reviewer's evaluations submitted in connection with the faculty member's proposed promotion and tenure.

Some faculty prefer to waive the right to review evaluation materials requested from on-campus and off-campus reviewers. You may execute the waiver below, if you choose to do so. However, it is not required, and all faculty are entitled to and will receive full and fair evaluation of dossier materials submitted in support of promotion and tenure, including evaluations, whether submitted confidentially or not. You will retain your right of access to written evaluations prepared by your department, college, dean, and the Provost and Executive Vice President, although the confidentiality and identity of other reviewers referred to in these evaluations will be maintained.

Dossier Guidelines

DOSSIER PREPARATION GUIDELINES 2008–2009

Dossiers for 2008–2009 are due in the Office of Academic Affairs no later than February 20, 2009.

Please submit the original dossier and five double-sided, binder clipped copies, assembled, and with each section clearly marked, as follows:

I. COVER PAGE

Include name of candidate, department and table of contents. All pages should be numbered.

II. FORM A

Include check list Form A found at:

http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/promoten/forms/form_A-07.pdf.

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. A copy of the current waiver form is available at:

http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/promoten/forms/waiver_access.doc. 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.

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.

V. CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT

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.

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.

- A. The unit chair or head or designee requests a list of names of current and recent students, including advisees from the candidate.
- B. The unit P&T committee and the supervisor (normally unit chair or head) jointly generate an additional list of student names.
- C. 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.
- D. 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.

- E. As a rule $\frac{1}{2}$ of the letters should be from the list generated by the candidate and $\frac{1}{2}$ 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.
- F. Units that use a series of standardized questions to help guide student input are strongly encouraged to work with Academic Affairs and OSU Legal Counsel prior to asking for information from students.
- G. 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. (<http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/archives/schedule/admin.html> .) The names of the students and the content of the letters are kept confidential if the candidate has signed a waiver of access.
- H. 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.
 - As a rule, $\frac{1}{2}$ should be from a list provided by the candidate and $\frac{1}{2}$ from a list generated by the unit.
 - 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).
- I. The student committee is provided with the student referee letters, student oriented teaching and advising portion of the dossier (e.g. excluding faculty peer review), plus any additional available information pertinent to their review.
- J. 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.
- K. 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).
- L. 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.

SAMPLE REQUEST FOR STUDENT LETTER OF EVALUATION

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE LETTERS OF EVALUATION

- Departmental Faculty Committee Letter
- Department Chair or Department Head Letter
- Letters from Other Administrators with Supervisory Responsibility
- 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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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

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.

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

Solicited Letters of Evaluation from Outside Leaders in the Field (5 minimum, 8 maximum for professorial faculty; 4 for Faculty Research Assistants and Instructors)

Letters should generally be from leaders in the candidate's field, chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's scholarly work. Letters should not be solicited from co-authors, co-principal investigators, former professors, or former students. If such letters are necessary, include an explanation and state why the evaluator can be objective. 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. For FRA's and Instructors, the letters can be from internal evaluators who have worked with the candidate but can objectively evaluate the candidate's dossier. Careful consideration should be given to minimizing conflict of interest when choosing all evaluators.

The candidate may submit a list of individuals meeting these criteria and, from this list, at least three will be selected by the department chair or head (or chair of the unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee). The other reviewers 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 department 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. Clearly indicate which outside reviewers were chosen by the candidate. In the final dossier, no more than half of the outside reviewers can be chosen by the candidate.

A representative form letter can be found at: SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVE FORM, 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.

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.

POLICY ON SALARY INCREASES FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

BACKGROUND

This policy deals with the salary increase associated with a promotion in academic rank. The academic ranks in question are for promotions from: Instructor to Senior Instructor, Faculty Research Assistant to Senior Faculty Research Assistant, Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and Associate Professor to Professor. The current policy is that promotions in rank bring a fixed 5% increase in salary, and that the increase is funded by the college and/or department. However, it appears that the current policy has not been followed consistently throughout the University.

An ad-hoc committee, chaired by Steve Davis and including Sally Francis, Peter Bloome, John Walstad, Doris Tilles, and Bob Wess, was asked to review the current policy. The committee

reviewed the current policy, assessed how it is currently being implemented and made recommendations. The recommendations were then reviewed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Academic Deans, and President's Cabinet. Based on the input from these groups, the following policy has been established.

POLICY

- This policy covers promotions in rank to Senior Instructor, Senior Faculty Research Assistant, Associate Professor, and Professor.
- The following increases will be used for promotions in academic rank effective on the following dates:
 - 6.5% on July 1, 1999
 - 8.0% on July 1, 2000
 - 10% on July 1, 2001 and thereafter.
- The salary increase will be funded by the department and/or college, as is the current arrangement.
- The Office of Human Resources will assist units in implementing the salary increases.

RATIONALE FOR POLICY

- In a faculty member's career at OSU, there are a limited number of promotions. These promotions occur as a result of meritorious service and, therefore, the rewards for these accomplishments should be significant.
- Peer institutions provide salary increases at the time of promotion, which are generally greater than 5%.
- Over time, this policy may help to reduce the degree of salary compression resulting from escalating salaries of new hires.

(May, 1999)

Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Appointments and Promotion

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

GUIDELINES FOR CLINICAL FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION

The faculties of the colleges and schools of pharmacy at the University of Georgia, the University of Maryland, Mercer University, The University of Michigan and the University of Washington are acknowledged for permitting use of their promotion documents. In addition, the faculties at the University of Idaho, Texas A & M University and Washington State University are acknowledged for permitting use of their promotion documents with regard to psychologists and student affairs faculty.

The Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of Oregon State University were relied upon heavily in terms of defining the broad areas and diversity of responsibility of Oregon State University faculty.

I. GENERAL PURPOSE

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide criteria and procedures for evaluation and promotion of clinical track faculty at Oregon State University. These guidelines serve to define and differentiate clinical track faculty appointments from the traditional academic (tenure) track. These guidelines are consistent with the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of Oregon State University, particularly as they related to promotion, and will be implemented in conjunction with those guidelines. These guidelines should not be interpreted to alter the provisions of Board rules on fixed term appointments.

II. ACADEMIC POSITIONS

This document defines the broad range of responsibilities of clinical faculty at Oregon State University and serves to provide guidance to clinical faculty in assessing the appropriateness of their activities. The scope of responsibilities outlined in the mission statement of Oregon State University dictates that the faculty be comprised of individuals with widely varying activities and responsibilities to fulfill the mission of the University.

In recognition of this, Oregon State University recognizes several faculty categories. Each category is created to be unique to the responsibilities and expectations of faculty within, but nothing in this document is to imply a hierarchy of importance between tenure track and clinical track faculty.

Clinical Track Faculty

The mission of Oregon State University in preparing students at the professional doctoral level, masters level, and baccalaureate level requires that some faculty be excellent clinicians and educators, with a significant responsibility toward both. Position titles include Clinical Instructor, Clinical Senior Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor. The clinical track classification is to be used only for faculty who are engaged almost entirely in clinical practice and teaching, though, scholarship and university service is expected. Development of an independent research program is not essential, and most scholarship activities are expected to contribute to professional issues or program development. Clinical track faculty are not eligible for tenure.

III. PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT OF CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

The process for identifying and evaluating candidates for initial appointment to clinical track positions will follow the same faculty search committee procedures as for traditional academic (tenure) track appointments. Announcements and position descriptions will clearly state the nature of the position.

Clinical track faculty appointments are fixed term for a period of one year. Reappointment is at the discretion of the department head/dean.

Candidates for appointment at the rank of Clinical Instructor are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate competence in clinical care, teaching and educational development, scholarly activities, and service as appropriate to the discipline. Candidates for appointment or promotion to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor and above are expected to demonstrate a balance of accomplishment and competence in clinical care, teaching and educational development, scholarship, and service to the College and profession and to establish a local, regional or national reputation as making significant contributions appropriate to the rank and discipline.

Faculty members in the clinical track will be evaluated annually by the department head. The evaluation will include an assessment of the individual's involvement in educational programs, student teaching/counseling evaluations, and scholarly and service contributions. When a faculty member wishes to be considered for promotion he or she will submit a dossier, and the department head will make a recommendation to the unit Personnel Committee (Promotion and Review Committee) and ask for its evaluation of the faculty member's progress. The Personnel Committee (Promotion and Review Committee) will recommend whether or not to promote. Reviews and recommendations at the college and university levels will follow procedures established by the Oregon State University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines as applicable to promotions. The Provost will make the final decision on whether or not to promote.

IV. CLINICAL FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES AND EVALUATION

Teaching

The central role of teaching is clearly articulated in the mission of Oregon State University. Clinical faculty engage in a variety of teaching responsibilities which may include: teaching credit courses; supervising the clinical work of students, interns, or post-graduate associates; providing non-credit programs and workshops, distance-learning programs, seminars, and continuing education. In addition some faculty may direct undergraduate and graduate projects, internships, and serve on master and doctoral committees, as well as mentoring undergraduate and graduate students and postdoctoral associates. When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students. The five areas of effective teaching and thus areas of assessment include: Communication Skills, Stimulation of Thinking, Interaction with Students, Knowledge, and Course Management. Examples of criteria to be used in evaluation of these areas include:

Communication Skills—enthusiastic and dynamic, good speaker with good delivery, clear and concise presentation of material, excellent in one-to-one and small group discussions.

Stimulation of Thinking—utilizes teaching methodologies that facilitate development of the students' decision-making and problem-solving skills and the synthesis, evaluation and application of knowledge; stimulates students to pursue professional interests beyond the minimum requirements in the classroom, practice site, and laboratory.

Interaction with Students—Motivates students, sensitive to student needs, demonstrates patience, fair and impartial, attentive to student comments and questions, skilled in observing student reactions.

Knowledge—Is knowledgeable of current concepts and new developments in the discipline and incorporates them in course materials; discards outmoded concepts or places them in proper perspective.

Course Management—Develops course objectives, and presents them to students; teaches and tests consistently with course objectives; develops and uses educational materials properly.

Evaluation of teaching is based on a combination of peer evaluations and learner or participant evaluation. Peer evaluations should be based both on observation of teaching and on review of course-related materials. It is expected that the candidate will have consistently documented good to excellent ratings in teaching to be promoted.

Documentation

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide in the dossier the following documentation of teaching performance:

- A. Provided by the candidate:
 - A self evaluation (portfolio) documenting teaching performance, competence, and description of future plans. Information should include course syllabi, course objectives, samples of handouts or other teaching aids, and samples of examinations and/or other evaluation instruments.
 - Evidence of attendance at professional and scientific meetings/conferences.
 - Evidence that the clinical practice activities are used as a model for teaching.
 - Any other material or information which may be helpful in the evaluation process. Examples are teaching awards, authorship of textbooks or other teaching materials, participation in teachers' seminars, participation in visiting or exchange teacher programs, and evaluation of presentations from programs presented to practitioners or other university constituencies.
- B. Provided by students:
 - All summary instructor and course evaluation reports or other appropriate systems submitted by students for each course taught will be supplied via the dossier.

C. Provided by peers:

- Peer evaluation of teaching performance is a valuable tool in providing feedback to faculty. As methods are developed and standardized, such evaluations will be supplied to aid in assessment of teaching competence.

Advising

Faculty involvement in advising students is an essential part of the teacher/learner relationship. Clinical faculty may have significant expectations to serve as advisors for students. These duties may include but are not limited to:

Faculty advisor for student groups;
Career development advising;
Academic Advising;
Academic Success and student development advising.

Documentation

The faculty member should list achievements in all appropriate categories based on position description.

Clinical Practice

Clinical practice is recognized as an important and essential component of a clinical faculty member's career development and position responsibilities. Clinical faculty are required to develop and maintain a clinical practice.

The application of knowledge in the clinical setting in order to optimally influence the delivery of health care to patients and clients is an essential feature of the clinical faculty's role within Oregon State University. In addition, attention to the many legal and ethical dimensions of health care delivery and patient/client care is an essential component in the practice world. The clinical faculty are diverse in terms of clinical areas of expertise and training as well as in assignments: laboratories, health care facilities, classrooms, health care administration, and student services.

Clinical faculty must provide evidence that the practice has a demonstrable effect on health care outcomes within a practice setting, that the practitioner is an essential member of the practice group, and that there is continuous professional growth in the practice area.

Evaluation of clinical practice for clinical faculty is based on a combination of systematic peer evaluations, documented clinical interventions and outcomes, self-evaluation of practice activities, evaluation by those served by the clinical practice, and where appropriate, evaluations from individuals both on and off campus who are familiar with the faculty

member's practice activities. Examples of clinical practice evidence appropriate for evaluation includes but is not limited to:

- Evidence that the practice has had and will continue to have demonstrable effect on health care outcomes within a practice setting.
- Evidence that the practice has influenced the nature of other types of health care delivery toward more optimal delivery of health care.
- Evidence that the practitioner is an essential member of the practice group.
- Evidence that the practitioner is recognized by peers locally, regionally, or nationally commensurate with academic rank.
- Evidence of establishment of new or innovative types of patient care services.
- Evidence of faculty development activities which enhance level of practice such as licensure and board certification.

Documentation

The faculty member should list achievements in all appropriate categories based on position description. In addition the following materials as appropriate should be provided in the dossier:

- A self-evaluation of service, including a description of the practice activities and percentage of time devoted in all areas.
- Documented evaluations of clinical service projects.
- Documented clinical intervention and outcomes.
- Names and addresses of individuals both on and off campus who are familiar with the faculty member's clinical service activities (e.g., clinical coordinator, committee chairs, coordinators or chairs of meetings or activities in which the faculty member participated, other health care professionals).
- Critical evaluation by other health care professionals, clinical supervisors, attending physicians, and/or house staff.
- Any other documents which will support the candidate's statements regarding the categories of evaluation.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

All Oregon State University faculty in the professorial ranks have a responsibility to engage in scholarship and creative activity. Scholarship and creative activity are understood to be intellectual work whose significance is validated by peers and which is communicated. In general, scholarly expectations for clinical track faculty will be between 5 and 15% of the individual's total position expectations. This level of scholarly expectation differs from tenure track faculty who have relatively larger scholarly expectations.

The appropriateness and importance of the type of scholarship will vary with the expectations of the position. The principle of peer review and recognition becomes increasingly important as the faculty member progresses through academic ranks. In the case of clinical faculty, emphasis is placed on peer recognition as a practitioner–educator. The peer recognition results from scholarly accomplishments that can take many forms. The order of examples is not intended to rank importance. While publication in peer reviewed journals is the most traditional form of scholarship, clinical track publications might more commonly encompass description and evaluation of novel patient care services, program development and innovation, outcomes of innovative programs and/or services, definitive therapy reviews, or case reports among others. Authorship of professional practice guidelines, textbooks, book chapters, monographs, videotapes, extended learning materials, or other educational materials is considered appropriate. Invited presentations, poster and podium presentations, and published abstracts at state and national levels are other examples of scholarship, provided that evidence of peer validation is provided. Advising government agencies, industry, or professional groups are all considered evidence of scholarship. Authorship of a patent in the faculty member’s field is considered as evidence of creative scholarship.

Honorary degrees, awards recognizing professional and/or scientific achievements, and fellowship in national professional and/or scientific organizations are all considered recognition by peers of the candidate’s contributions. The candidate’s role in multiauthored publications must be addressed.

Documentation

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide documentation of scholarly and creative works in the dossier.

Service

All faculty are expected to engage in service to the University and its constituents, the community, and the professional discipline. Service is central to the mission of a land–grant institution. Examples include but are not limited to: In–services provided to health care professionals, committee/task force memberships, chairpersonships, recruitment of faculty and students, mentoring students and student groups, and service in faculty governance. In addition, service to the professional discipline is identified by time and effort given to local, state, regional, national, or international professional organizations and/or publication. Examples include: continuing education programs, organizational offices, committee involvement, task force reports/policy statements, editorial board/referee/reviewer for professional or scientific publications.

Public service related to the faculty member’s assignment and that draws upon the professional expertise of the faculty member or that significantly fosters university relations is valuable to promotion decisions. Examples include: Discipline–related community service projects, invited

presentations to the lay public, consultation with community health–care agencies. Honors and awards recognizing professional, scientific, and/or clinical service achievement would also be included in the Service area.

Documentation

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the documentation of the activity in all of the above categories in the dossier.

V. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

Criteria for Promotion from Clinical Instructor to Clinical Senior Instructor

Criteria for promotion within this rank will follow the guidelines established in the Oregon State University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Criteria for Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor

In general, a requirement for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor is achievement of regional, statewide or national recognition as a practitioner–educator. Promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor is based upon the candidate’s:

- Demonstrated effectiveness in teaching including communication skills, stimulation of thinking, interaction with students, knowledge, and course management.
- Demonstrated effectiveness in clinical practice that has had and will continue to have demonstrable effect on outcomes within a practice setting.
- Achievement in scholarship and creative activity that is recognized as contributing to the body of knowledge in the practice discipline.
- Appropriate institutional, public, and professional service.

Criteria for Promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor

In general, a requirement for promotion to Clinical Professor is achievement of national recognition as a practitioner–educator. Promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor is based upon evidence of the candidate’s:

- Distinction in teaching, as evident in continuing development and sustained effectiveness in communication skills, stimulation of thinking, interaction with students, knowledge, and course management.
- Distinction in clinical practice, as evidenced by professional recognition in the specific discipline.
- Distinction in scholarship and creative activity relative to the specific discipline.
- Exemplary institutional, public, and/or professional service.

Evidence of national recognition may include but is not limited to:

- Sustained contribution to a discipline;
- Invited lectures at national scientific or professional meetings;
- Invited chapters in textbooks;
- Honors or awards from national organizations;
- Service on editorial boards;
- Service as a reviewer for professional/scientific publications;
- Consultantships;
- Relevant comments from external reviewers;
- Elected/appointed to leadership positions in the profession/professional organizations.

VI. CLINICAL FACULTY DOSSIERS

Preparation of the dossier for clinical track faculty will be consistent with the Oregon State University guidelines for traditional academic (tenure) track faculty utilizing the documentation of clinical practice components and achievements.