

PROMOTION and TENURE POLICY
DEPARTMENT of BOTANY and PLANT PATHOLOGY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Approved June 4, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	
	A.	Background and Philosophy 1
	B.	Overview of Process..... 1
II.	P&T EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	
	A.	Function of the P&T Executive Committee 2
	B.	Composition of the P&T Executive Committee..... 2
	C.	Election of the P&T Executive Committee 2
	D.	Responsibilities of the P&T Executive Committee 2
III.	MENTORING ACTIVITIES	
	A.	Professorial Faculty 3
	B.	Faculty Research Assistants 4
IV.	TEACHING REVIEW ACTIVITIES	5
V.	MID-TERM REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	5
VI.	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE	
	A.	Identification of Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure..... 6
	B.	Evaluation of Professorial Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure 6
	C.	Process for Evaluation of Teaching and Advising 7
	D.	Evaluation of Faculty Research Assistants for Promotion to Senior Faculty Research Assistant 8
	E.	Evaluation of Instructors for Promotion to Senior Instructor 10
VII.	FACULTY DOSSIERS	
	A.	Faculty Responsibility 11
	B.	Composition of Professorial Faculty Dossiers 11
	C.	Composition of the Dossiers of Faculty Research Assistants 13
	D.	Composition of the Dossiers of Instructors 14
VIII.	DOSSIER EVALUATION/VOTING ELIGIBILITY	14
IX.	BALLOTING PROCEDURES	14
X.	CALENDAR	15
APPENDIX		
	A.	Sample Position Description. 16
	B.	Sample CV 18
	C.	Procedures, letters & forms for evaluation of teaching & advising..... 27

**PROMOTION and TENURE GUIDELINES
DEPARTMENT of BOTANY and PLANT PATHOLOGY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY**

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background and Philosophy

The Oregon State University (OSU) Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide the basic University philosophy and policy for Promotion and Tenure (P&T); these are supplemented by additional policies of the Department as contained in this document. The OSU Guidelines guarantee the individual access to all materials submitted for evaluation and the opportunity to respond in writing. Because faculty members in the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology take responsibility for their own materials, they have access on a continuing basis. The only exceptions are solicited evaluations that the faculty member has agreed will be kept confidential.

Faculty in this Department have diverse responsibilities in Extension, as Program Directors, and in other roles as well as traditional teaching, research and service responsibilities. It is not possible for one document to address all of our individual circumstances. The Department P&T Guidelines establish a general model, but we recognize that it must be adapted to meet the needs of individual faculty on a case-by-case basis.

B. Overview of Process

The promotion and tenure process in this Department is guided by four principles:

1. The individual faculty member is responsible for preparing in a timely way a dossier that clearly and effectively presents his or her own case (see Sections VI & VII).
2. The Department will actively assist faculty members to succeed through mentoring and early review of teaching (see Sections III & IV).
3. The Department P&T Committee is comprised of all faculty tenured in the Department; evaluation and voting on a file is done by those Committee members senior in rank to the candidate (see Section IX).
4. An elected P&T Executive Committee (see Section II) administers the process.

The process starts in the Spring of each year with the election of the P&T Executive Committee and the identification of candidates. Candidates present their dossiers at the beginning of June for a preliminary evaluation by the Department P&T Committee in the last week of Spring Term. If the Committee members judge the likelihood of success to be high then external letters of evaluation will be sought. Evaluation will be based initially and most importantly on the dossier documenting the candidate's achievements. Additional evaluations will be sought from faculty peers and students, and from external peers. A final vote by signed ballot will be held before the end of Fall Term to determine the Department P&T Committee's recommendation. If the recommendation is favorable, the dossier will be forwarded to the Dean and ultimately to the Provost for final action. Dossiers of assistant professors in their 6th year are forwarded regardless of the faculty vote, as are dossiers of candidates who specifically so request. In all cases, the recommendation of the Department P&T Committee will reflect the vote of the Committee.

II. P&T EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A. Function of the P&T Executive Committee

The P&T Executive Committee assists the Department Chairperson and represents the faculty in the management and organization of the P&T process.

B. Composition of the P&T Executive Committee

The P&T Executive Committee consists of five full professors tenured in the Department.

C. Election of the P&T Executive Committee

The entire voting faculty elects the members of the P&T Executive Committee for terms of three years. Terms of service are staggered to ensure that at least two members of the Committee provide continuity from the previous year. All full-professors tenured in the Department stand for election to the Committee, except for individuals currently serving or completing a three-year term of service on the Committee. Election to the Committee is by plurality vote of those faculty submitting written ballots within 7 days of an election date specified by the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson conducts the election before the end of Spring Term. New members of the Executive Committee take office at the end of Spring Term.

If an elected member of the P&T Executive Committee is unable to complete the 3-year term of service, the Department Chairperson appoints a tenured, full professor to serve until the elected member of the Committee is able to return to service or the term of service is completed.

The members of the P&T Executive Committee select the Chair of the P&T Executive Committee.

D. Responsibilities of the P&T Executive Committee

1. Assisting the Chairperson in the identification of the annual promotion and tenure activities.
2. Oversight of the compilation of promotion and tenure dossiers for review and evaluation by the Department P&T Committee and external reviewers.
3. Scheduling the review and evaluation of dossiers.
4. Supervision of balloting procedures associated with promotion and tenure recommendations.
5. Appointment of Mentoring Teams and Faculty Peer Teaching, Review Teams
6. Informing new faculty members of the promotion and tenure procedures and policies of the Department and University.
7. Maintenance of records needed for documenting and planning the activities of the Committee.

The P&T Executive Committee shall not make recommendations to the faculty concerning specific promotion and tenure actions.

III. MENTORING ACTIVITIES

The Department provides mentoring for faculty who have not yet reached their highest rank or tenure. The mentoring process provides a formal mechanism for early communication between the faculty member and the P&T Committee. The procedures are outlined below.

A. Professorial Faculty

1. The P&T Executive Committee meets with new professorial faculty members (who have not yet attained their highest rank) shortly after they begin their positions with the Department. The faculty member is given the Departmental P&T Guidelines and a template for curriculum vitae (CV) and Position Description. The P&T Executive Committee describes the role and procedures of the P&T Committee and the preparation and maintenance of the CV and dossier.
2. Mentoring Teams, consisting of two faculty members tenured in the Department and senior in rank to the faculty member being mentored, are appointed yearly by the P&T Executive Committee. To ensure continuity and diversity, one team member will repeat from the previous year, while a new individual will replace the second member.
3. The standard mentoring procedure for all tenure-track, research, and courtesy Assistant and Associate Professors, outlined below, will occur annually for Assistant Professors and biennially for Associate Professors, during winter or spring term. Instructors may request mentoring, if they so desire.
4. Each person due for mentoring shall be asked to prepare a summary of his or her activities and accomplishments since the last mentoring, based on their current job description, and a written self-assessment. The self-assessment shall be based on activities that have occurred since the most recent previous assessment, and will ordinarily be < 1 page in length. A standard form for this summary and self- assessment (the Periodic Activity and Self-Assessment Report form), similar to that used when salary raises are being decided, will be provided. (If a Courtesy faculty member is already required to complete such a summary and assessment for their employer, e.g., USDA, the faculty member can submit this instead of the Departmental form.) The form includes specific prompts and space for the P&T Executive Committee (or the appointed mentors; see below) to write evaluative comments. The self-assessment, along with an updated cv will be submitted to the administrative support person handling promotion and tenure documents.
5. Assistant and Associate Professors (or Instructors, if they request mentoring) being mentored will be offered the opportunity to meet with a two-person mentoring team during the years in which mentoring occurs. Research and courtesy professors may decline this opportunity if they wish, in which case comments on their file may be written by the P & T Executive Committee using the space provided on the form. Tenure-track Assistant professors and tenured Associate Professors, however, will be expected to accept this offer, and comments on their file will be written by that two-person committee.
6. The full Department P&T committee (tenured instructors and tenured, associate and full professors). Tenure-track assistant professors are invited to attend and become familiar with procedures. All members of the full P&T committee participate in this discussion of files, regardless of relative rank.

7. The mentoring team will write a brief summary of the full P&T committee's discussion on the Periodic Activity and Self-assessment Report form, and this summary will be made available to the person being mentored, the P & T Executive Committee, and the Department Chair.
8. The evaluation form with written comments from the P&T committee will be made available to the person being mentored, who will be asked to sign the document and provide written rebuttal/response as appropriate. The form, and any written rebuttal/response, will then become part of the individual's personnel file. Subsequent discussion with P&T Executive committee, the mentoring committee, or the Department Chair will be arranged if warranted.

The faculty member should consider his or her assigned mentors as appropriate individuals from whom to seek advice, and to make sure that no important information has been overlooked throughout the process. Faculty members also are encouraged to seek counsel from other members of the faculty and not to rely entirely on their assigned mentors.

Note that mentoring does not replace the requirement for yearly evaluation by the Departmental Chairperson for faculty on annual tenure or for required periodic reviews of tenured faculty.

B. Faculty Research Assistants (FRAs)

1. The supervising faculty member has special responsibilities with regard to the mentoring of a FRA, starting at the time of hire. Newly hired FRAs should receive a copy of the job description that clearly describes the responsibilities of the position. The job description, which should be reviewed at the time of annual review, serves as the basis for evaluation of achievement. Annual evaluations should include a discussion of performance and any expectations for position development or possible promotion.
2. A formal mentoring process is initiated in the spring of each year for FRAs who wish to be considered candidates for promotion to Senior FRA I and II. To begin the mentoring process, the FRA must notify his or her supervisor and the chair of the P&T Executive Committee that they wish to be considered for promotion.
3. A Mentoring Team, composed of one tenured faculty member and one Senior FRA I or II as appropriate, is appointed by the P&T Executive Committee to advise the candidate on dossier preparation.
4. It is the responsibility of the Mentoring Team to schedule the initial meeting with the candidate and to provide advice and information concerning the preparation of the dossier.
5. It is the responsibility of the candidate to prepare his or her dossier and to keep the Mentoring Team informed of progress, to ask questions that may arise, and to request additional meetings as needed.
6. See guidelines for Promotion to Senior FRA I and II.

IV. TEACHING REVIEW ACTIVITIES.

The Department provides regular peer review of teaching for those faculty who have not yet reached their highest rank or tenure. Peer review of teaching is also conducted, as needed, to aid any faculty member in addressing particular teaching problems and to ensure high standards of teaching.

1. Peer Teaching Review Teams for Instructors, Assistant Professors, and Associate Professors are appointed by the P&T Executive Committee. These Teams consist of faculty tenured in the Department and senior in rank to the faculty member being reviewed.
2. Peer teaching reviews are conducted annually for Instructors and Assistant Professors and every 3 years for Senior I Instructors and Associate Professors with an additional review, if necessary, in the year of promotion.
3. Peer teaching review of senior faculty (Senior II Instructors or Professors) may be initiated by the Department Chairperson or the faculty member. In the case of senior faculty, the Chairperson, in consultation with the Departmental Executive Committee, will name the Peer Teaching Review Team.
4. Peer Teaching Review Teams evaluate teaching effectiveness based on visits to the classroom, instructional laboratory, or extension presentations, and on analysis of course syllabi and other printed course materials provided by the faculty member.
5. For junior faculty members, the Peer Teaching Review Team reports its evaluation orally to the Department P&T Committee. A letter of evaluation is provided to the faculty member, the P&T Executive Committee, and the Department Chairperson. The written evaluation becomes part of the candidate's personnel file. The Chairperson discusses the written evaluation with the faculty member during the annual evaluation. For senior faculty members, the Peer Teaching Review Team reports its evaluation in a letter to the faculty member and to the Department Chairperson.
6. Faculty with extension appointments will supply a list of clients. Clients will be asked to evaluate the teaching of the candidate by completing a form or writing a letter. Forms will be summarized and the summary included in the dossier. Letters and forms received will be included in the summary letter of the Peer Teaching Review Committee and letters may be included in the dossier.

V. MID-TERM REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed during the third year after appointment. The composition of the dossier and the procedures will follow exactly those outlined for Promotion and Tenure below and by the University P & T Guidelines, with the following exceptions:

1. Letters from evaluators external to the University will NOT be sought
2. The dossier will be submitted to the College level only.
3. Letters will then be written only by the College P & T Committee, and the Dean, evaluating the candidate's progress towards the full P & T process.

VI. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The University expects faculty members will achieve distinction in teaching (which includes most extension activities) and scholarship (usually through research) and provide exemplary service as collegial and constructive members of the University and professional Community. The relative emphasis to be expected for these areas is determined by the position description.

The following sections are meant to clarify the application of the University standards to the promotion and tenure process in the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology.

A. Identification of Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure

1. The expected process is for individual faculty members to take the initiative to put their own name into consideration; this usually involves consultation with the mentoring team and Department Chairperson.
2. The Department P&T Committee may initiate the process.
3. The Department Chairperson may put a candidate forward for consideration.
4. Only Assistant Professors in their 6th year will be automatically considered for promotion and tenure.

B. Evaluation of Professorial Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure

General Expectations: The Department expects the candidate to be creative in his or her position, to produce a body of significant, high-quality work, to show initiative in developing programs and disseminating results, and thereby to gain the positive recognition of others in the profession and among users of their services. Contributions are expected in all areas of academic endeavor. A positive recommendation for promotion or tenure will be based on the candidate's past record and future potential as an effective member of the academic community.

Department P&T Committee evaluation of Teaching will be based on:

1. Documentation in the CV, including list of courses taught by term, a summary of the standardized "Student Evaluation of Teaching" forms and list of teaching honors (See sample CV).
2. Reports of Peer Teaching Review Teams.
3. Written comments and surveys solicited from current and former students and Graduate Teaching Assistants.
4. The candidate's statement of teaching goals and accomplishments.
5. Written and oral reviews of the teaching portion of the candidate's dossier by a Student Teaching Evaluation Committee and a Peer Teaching Review Committee.

6. Other material as relevant to the case.

Department P&T Committee evaluation of Advising will be based on:

1. Documentation in the CV, including the number of undergraduates advised (if any) by year and program, and a list of graduate students advised, including year of degree and current position.
2. The candidate's statement of advising goals.
3. Solicited letters of evaluation from current and former graduate students, post-doctoral scholars, and from undergraduate advisees.

Department P&T Committee evaluation of Scholarship will be based on:

1. Documentation in the CV, including lists of publications, grants and other research support, other research communications (seminars, workshops, symposia, etc.), and honors for scholarship (see sample CV).
2. Published manuscripts and manuscripts in press since the last promotion. The candidate should identify the five publications he or she regards as the most significant since the last promotion.
3. Candidate's statement of research or scholarship goals and accomplishments.
4. Solicited external peer letters of evaluation.
5. Evaluation of other assigned duties will be conducted as appropriate, based on the position description.

Department P&T Committee evaluation of Service will be based on:

1. Documentation in the CV of candidate's collegial and constructive service to the Department, College, University and his or her profession (see sample CV).
2. Solicited external letters of evaluation, as appropriate.

C. Process for Evaluation of Teaching and Advising

Teaching and advising are important parts of most faculty position descriptions and their evaluation is an important component of most P&T evaluations. Teaching is an integral part of most Extension appointments, and Extension teaching will be evaluated in a manner parallel to the procedures described here. Teaching and advising effectiveness will be reviewed and evaluated by a Student Teaching Evaluation Committee and by a Peer Teaching Review Committee. The Department solicits written comments from a sample of former students. The comments must be signed, and they are available to the candidate, but only upon specific request.

Student Teaching Evaluation Committee: according to the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, students shall participate in the review and assessment of the teaching portion of the dossier. The Department Chairperson shall appoint a Student Teaching Evaluation Committee comprised of both graduate and undergraduate students to evaluate those portions of the candidate's dossier related to teaching. University guidelines must be followed for the composition of the Student Committee and their duties. The Committee will evaluate the summaries of the standardized "Student Evaluation of Teaching" forms, outcome surveys of former students, comments from Graduate Teaching Assistants supervised, the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy, and teaching materials related to classes taught. The Student Committee summarizes its evaluation in a written letter to the Dean and participates in the discussion of the Department P&T Committee relevant to the teaching activities of the candidate. The letter becomes part of the dossier.

Peer Teaching Review Committee: The P&T Executive Committee appoints the Peer Teaching Review Committee which includes two department faculty members and a faculty member from outside the department. The Peer Teaching Review Committee is responsible for evaluating the teaching and advising portions of the dossier. The teaching review is based on numerical summaries of "Student Evaluation of Teaching" scores, written comments solicited from former students, review of course syllabi and other materials provided by the candidate, the letters summarizing the reports of the Peer Teaching Review Teams, and the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy. Evaluation of advising is based on, letters solicited from current and former graduate students, post-doctoral scholars, and undergraduate advisees, and the statement of advising philosophy.

The Peer Teaching Review Committee summarizes its evaluation in a written letter to the Dean and participates in the discussion of the Department P&T Committee relevant to the teaching and advising activities of the candidate. The letter becomes part of the dossier.

D. Evaluation of Faculty Research Assistants for Promotion to Senior Faculty Research Assistants

A FRA may be promoted to Senior FRA I and then Senior FRA II in recognition of distinguished professional service. Promotion, however, is not automatic, nor is it granted for years of service alone. Because Senior FRAs are not granted tenure, employment is always contingent on performance and availability of funds.

Oregon State University's minimal criteria for promotion of FRAs to Senior FRA I and II are stated in the OSU Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. The University guidelines state those candidates for promotion to Senior FRA I must have:

1. Completed at least 4 years of service.
2. A graduate degree appropriate to the field in which the research activities are performed or comparable educational or professional experience.
3. Demonstrated a high level of competence, achievement, and potential in research or serve effectively in a position requiring high individual responsibility or special professional expertise.
4. Demonstrated 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.

Promotion to the rank of Senior Faculty Research Assistant II may be considered after 4 years of full time service at the rank of Senior Faculty Research Assistant I. The candidate must have a sustained record of exceptional achievement and evidence of professional growth and innovation in assigned tasks.

Senior Faculty Research Assistants I and II are eligible for extended fixed term contracts.

To be promoted to Senior FRA II, a candidate must have met these criteria (criteria were developed by BPP to be consistent with OSU criteria for other categories and ranks of faculty):

1. Demonstrated an exceptional level of competence and achievement in research, or served exceptionally in a position requiring high individual responsibility or special professional expertise.
2. Demonstrated an exceptional degree of initiative in research and leadership among research colleagues in the department, the university, and/or outside the university as documented in authorship, management responsibilities, and creative approaches to research.

Within the Department of Botany & Plant Pathology, the following additional criteria and considerations apply to candidates for promotion to Senior FRA I and II:

1. Candidates for promotion to Senior FRA I and II must have the support of the supervising faculty member.
2. FRAs who do not hold a graduate degree but hold a Bachelor's degree in an appropriate field may be considered for promotion to Senior FRA I after 6 years of service. The issue of comparable educational or professional experience must be clearly addressed by the FRA and the supervising faculty member in the candidate's dossier.
3. FRAs who have not yet met the required years of service (4 or 6 years within BPP), but have previous experience and have demonstrated expertise and achievement within their field sufficient to warrant promotion may be considered on an individual basis. However, in such cases, the FRA must have been employed within the Department for at least 2 years by September 15 of the year of review.
4. The promotion time-line is at the discretion of the supervising faculty member and is dependent upon both the nature of the position and the contributions made by the FRA. Some positions may not have the latitude to allow incumbents to demonstrate the professionalism and superior achievement necessary for promotion to Senior FRA I. Positions without possibility of promotion should be so identified by the supervisor.
5. The supervising faculty member is responsible for careful counsel of the FRA concerning promotion and for writing a supportive letter for the promotion dossier.
6. The candidate's file will be evaluated by the Department's Senior FRAs, who will prepare a letter of evaluation addressed to the Chair of the P&T Executive Committee. This letter becomes part of the dossier.

7. The Senior FRA who serves on the Mentoring Team will be present for discussion of the candidate's file with the P & T Committee.

FRA's who wish to be considered for promotion should notify their supervisor and the P&T Executive Committee before the end of Spring term.

E. Evaluation of Instructors for Promotion to Senior Instructor

OSU guidelines state that promotion from the rank of Instructor to Senior Instructor I 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 part-time instructors at 0.50 FTE or greater, promotion to Senior Instructor I may be considered after accumulating the equivalent of four years of full-time service in relation to the type of appointment (9 or 12-month). For fixed-term instructors with extended prior service, promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor I cannot be made effective before the end of the third year of full-time service or the accumulation of its equivalent for part-time instructors at 0.50 FTE or greater.

To be promoted, a candidate must:

1. Have a graduate degree appropriate to the assigned duties, or comparable educational or professional experience.
2. Have special skills or experience needed in the unit.
3. Have an exceptional record of achievement in the assigned duties.

Promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor II may be considered after four years of full-time service at the rank of Senior Instructor I or the accumulation of its equivalent for part-time Senior Instructor I at 0.50 FTE or greater. To be promoted, a candidate must have a sustained record of exceptional achievement and evidence of professional growth and innovation in assigned duties. Senior Instructors I and Senior Instructors II are eligible for extended fixed-term contracts. 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.

To be promoted to Senior Instructor II, a candidate must have met these criteria (criteria were developed by BPP to be consistent with OSU criteria for other categories and ranks of faculty):

1. Demonstrated a sustained record of exceptional achievement in the assigned duties.
2. Shown evidence of exceptional professional growth and innovation in assigned duties.

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 contributions 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.

VII. FACULTY DOSSIERS

A. Faculty Responsibility

The candidate is responsible for preparing most of the documents needed to support his or her application for promotion or tenure. Development of the dossier should begin with entry into the department and should be updated annually. This document will be available to the Mentoring Team, for the Chairperson's annual evaluation of the faculty member, and for development of departmental summary information. All documentation must be available by deadlines requested by the P&T Executive Committee.

During the periods of consideration for promotion or tenure, professorial candidates present a seminar to the faculty, highlighting their scholarly activities.

B. Composition of Professorial Faculty Dossiers

The candidate will provide the materials listed below (items 1-8) at the beginning of June prior to the academic year in which a promotion or tenure decision is sought. The candidate must review the dossier before evaluation to assure that it is accurate and complete. The documentation provided by the candidate must bear a signature line attesting to the accuracy and completeness of the file and releasing it for use by the Department P&T Committee. The candidate may have access to all items, unless he or she signs a waiver of access to solicited letters of evaluation.

1. Position description/s signed by candidate and department chairperson.
2. An up-to-date CV. The CV should consist of the following five sections: A. Education and employment information, B. Teaching, advising and other assignments, C. Scholarship and creative activity, D. Service, and E. Awards. Biographical and publication records should be cumulative from the start of the candidate's career.
3. A statement by the candidate (three page maximum) that addresses the candidate's contributions in the areas of scholarship and creative activity, teaching, advising, service and other assignments. This should include the following components:
 - a). A description of the past, current, and planned program of research or other scholarly activity including a description of the contributions of the work to human welfare or knowledge. The statement should be limited to 1¼ pages, and be understandable to an educated person outside the candidate's field (e.g., another faculty member).
 - b). A statement of teaching goals, success and philosophy which includes the candidate's interpretation of student and peer evaluations, evaluation of any major past and

continuing problems in teaching, and discussion of attempts to alleviate those problems. The statement should be limited to $\frac{2}{3}$ page.

c). A statement of goals, philosophy, and contributions in advising and/or other assignments. The statement should be limited to $\frac{1}{3}$ page.

d). A statement that reflects the candidate's philosophy for involvement in professional service to the Department, College, University, his or her profession and the local community. This statement should be limited to $\frac{1}{3}$ page.

4. A listing of the candidate's five most important publications (since appointment for Assistant Professors, or since last promotion for Associate Professors), with an explanation of their particular significance. This list should be appended to the Candidate's Statement and will not fall within the three-page limit. This will be provided to outside reviewers but will not be included in the dossier.
5. All publications in the CV must be annotated to denote the role of the candidate and contributing authors. A key to the annotations must be tabulated in the CV.
6. Electronic copies of all publications, manuscripts in press, and table of contents of books (assistant professors), or since the previous promotion or tenure decision (associate professors).
7. Names, addresses and brief statement of status in the field of six potential professional peer reviewers from outside OSU from whom letters of evaluation can be requested. Peer evaluators should be individuals with experience and stature in the field of endeavor of the candidate. They should be persons of senior rank who are not close personal friends or professional collaborators of the candidate, and from similar institutions to Oregon State University. The P&T Executive Committee will select additional names. A total of 8-10 letters will be solicited; at least three from those nominated by the candidate. The reviewers will be provided with the candidate's CV, position description, candidate's statement, and copies of the five most important publications since appointment (Assistant Professor) or last promotion (Associate Professor). The peer reviewers will be informed whether or not the candidate has waived the right to examine letters of evaluation.
8. Additional material the candidate believes is necessary.

The following items will be added to a candidate's dossier as it is compiled for final evaluation and submission to the Dean:

1. Letters from external peer evaluators.
2. The letter from the Peer Teaching Review Committee.
3. The letter from the Student Teaching Evaluation Committee.

4. The letter from the Mentoring Team, which reports the results of the vote of the Department P&T Committee and summarizes the discussion that accompanied the vote and the basis of the Committee's recommendation for promotion or tenure.
5. The letter from the Department Chairperson, which provides the Chairperson's analysis of the candidate's record, a summary of the external evaluations, and a recommendation for promotion or tenure.

The letters from the Department P&T Committee, the Department Chairperson, Peer Teaching Review Committee and Student Teaching Evaluation Committees will be available to the candidate.

C. Composition of the Dossiers of Faculty Research Assistants

The dossiers of candidates for promotion to Senior FRA I and II will include:

1. Position description.
2. A CV emphasizing scholarly accomplishments in the current position.
3. A statement from the candidate summarizing his or her qualifications and accomplishments and a discussion of professional goals and aspirations. This statement should be brief, usually no more than 1 ½ pages.
4. A supportive letter of recommendation from the supervising faculty member.
5. If appropriate, reprints of three recent publications.
6. A list of two or three professional references (including addresses) from whom letters of support may be solicited. For Senior FRA I at least one reference should be outside of the department and one should be outside OSU. For Senior FRA II at least two references must be from outside OSU. A total of four letters will be sought from external evaluators; half will be suggested by the candidate.
7. Other documentation to demonstrate involvement and contributions to the Department, College, University, community, or profession.

The candidate must review the dossier before evaluation to assure that it is complete and sign a statement to that effect. The candidate may have access to all items in the dossier, unless he or she signs a waiver of access to solicited letters of evaluation.

The following items will be added to the candidate's dossier.

1. Letters from external and internal reviewers.
2. A letter from the Mentoring Team which reports the results of the vote of the P&T Committee and summarizes the results of the vote, the discussion that accompanied that decision, and the basis for the Committee's recommendation for promotion

3. A letter from the Department Chairperson providing his or her analysis of a candidate's record, a summary of the outside evaluations, and a recommendation for promotion.

4. The letter from the Senior FRA Committee.

The letters from the P&T Committee, the Department Chairperson and the Senior FRA committee will be available to the candidate.

D. Composition of Dossiers of Instructors

Dossiers will follow the same format as for professorial faculty dossiers, appropriate for the assigned duties outlined in the position description. A total of four letters of evaluation will be sought from external evaluators; half will be suggested by the candidate.

VIII. DOSSIER EVALUATION/VOTING ELIGIBILITY

All faculty members with tenure in the Department and with rank equivalent to or above that for which the recommendation is being considered participate in the voting. Thus, tenured instructors, associate and full professors comprise the Department P&T Committee for faculty research assistants and instructors, and tenured associate and full professors vote on assistant professors. Only tenured full professors evaluate and vote on associate professors.

IX. BALLOTING PROCEDURES

A formal written ballot will be made available to each eligible faculty member. Signed ballots will be counted at the end of the deliberations. The ballot count will be reported by the Department P & T Committee as the number of affirmative votes of all persons voting. A 2/3 majority of cast votes is required to advance a candidate to the next level of consideration, unless the candidate is in the 6th year as assistant professor or the candidate specifically requests that the file be forwarded regardless of the vote. Off-campus members of the Department P&T Committee are urged to attend all critical meetings, but dossiers will be sent and faculty, unable to attend, may vote *in absentia*, in advance of the campus vote (votes may be cast by email).

X. CALENDAR

Spring Term

Professorial candidates give a department seminar.

Mentoring Team and Peer Teaching Review Team reports reviewed by Department P&T Committee and tenure-track faculty with outcome provided in writing to mentored faculty (May).

New members of P&T Executive Committee elected (June).

Mentoring Teams for candidates seeking promotion in the next academic year are appointed by P&T Executive Committee.

Candidates provide dossier materials to the P&T Executive Committee by beginning of June.

Dossiers of candidates seeking promotion or tenure reviewed by P&T Committee and Committee votes to seek external letters of evaluation (June, last week of Spring Term).

Summer Term

Teaching survey and solicitation of comments sent to former students and graduate teaching assistants for candidates.

Fall Term

Student Teaching Evaluation Committee named by the Department Chairperson.

Peer Teaching Review Committee named by the P&T Executive Committee.

Senior FRA Committee review of FRA dossiers.

Final dossier of candidates seeking promotion or tenure evaluated and voted on by the Department P&T Committee (November/December).

Dossier transmitted to the Dean by the Department Chairperson (December/January).

Winter Term

College P & T Committee and Dean make appropriate decisions, write letters and submit dossier to Provost: Department Chairperson and candidate provided with copies of college letters.

Identification of candidates seeking promotion/tenure during the next academic year.

Annual or biennial Mentoring Teams identified by P&T Executive Committee.

Annual or triennial Peer Teaching Review Teams appointed by the P&T Executive Committee.

Annual or biennial mentoring sessions completed with reports to appropriate individuals.

Spring Term

Provost makes final decisions on pending dossiers.

Decisions are announced by June 15.

APPENDIX

A. SAMPLE POSITION DESCRIPTION

POSITION DESCRIPTION

Name and rank, (title if appropriate):

Appointment: 9 or 12 month

FTE: by College

Primary responsibilities:

Specific duties, with proportional effort, based on a 40-hour week. Hours beyond the 40-hr base are allocated at the individual's discretion. List details, i.e. course numbers, only if specifically assigned. Otherwise list the general activity appropriate for each relevant category.

Research and Scholarship - (%) - Expected of all Faculty

Teaching, Mentoring and Advising - (%) - Activities that generate Student Credit Hours, including Thesis and Research credits; both formal and informal, including advising of graduate students

Service - (%) - Activities in support of the University and its units, or the Profession. Expected of all Faculty. Usually 1-10%, depending on rank.

Extended Education - (%) - Professionally relevant interactions with the "public". Usually 1-5%; faculty with formal Extension responsibilities will show this category as their major effort.

Scholarship: minimum 15%. Overall scholarship can be included in, but not limited to, all activities listed under "Primary Responsibilities.

Signed and dated,
Faculty member

Department Chairperson

EXAMPLE 1:

Position Description

Name and Rank: Janet Brown, Assistant Professor

Appointment: 9 month

FTE: 1.0 College of Agricultural Sciences

Primary Responsibilities:

Research: 50%, maintain an externally funded research program conducting original and independent research and training in the area of genomic/computational plant ecology that is relevant to the natural resource and agricultural interests of Oregon. Aspire to achieve international standing, in part through collaboration with OSU colleagues.

Teaching, Mentoring and Advising: 40%, contribute to undergraduate and graduate education in Plant Ecology and area of expertise. Mentor and serve as research advisor to graduate students in their advanced degree programs in Botany and Plant Pathology, Molecular and Cell Biology, or related programs. Serve on the graduate committees of other graduate students. Serve as advisor and research mentor to undergraduate students.

Service: 10%, 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. University service includes serving on departmental, interdepartmental, program, college, and University committees. Professional service includes, but is not limited to, reviewing manuscripts for journals and proposals for national funding agencies, and involvement in professional organizations.

Scholarship: 25%, may include activities under any of the categories of 'Primary Responsibilities'. Scholarship and creative activities will primarily be in the area of genomic and /or computational plant ecology. Activities include, but are not limited to, peer reviewed publication of scientific research, development of scientific technologies/methodologies, integration of knowledge leading to new interpretations, and participation on steering committees, agency panels, and science working groups where the outcome is a fundamental change in the field's direction. Innovation in teaching strategies and development of new educational approaches may be included.

Lynda M. Ciuffetti, Head Date

Janet Brown Date

B. SAMPLE CV FOR DEPARTMENT P&T DOSSIER

The following organization and format for the CV will meet the department's requirements for the purposes of Promotion and Tenure, and for the annual updated CV required by the Chair. It includes the categories, in order, as stipulated by the University guidelines for the CV used for Promotion and Tenure. Omit categories that do not apply.

**CURRICULUM VITAE for FACULTY MEMBER
September 2000**

RANK: Professor

MAILING ADDRESS: Department of Botany and Plant Pathology
Oregon State University
2082 Cordley Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331-2902

COMMUNICATIONS: **Phone:** (541) 737-_____
E-mail: _____ **Fax:** (541) 737-3573

DATE OF BIRTH: [optional]

A. EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

EDUCATION:

1972	Ph.D.	Plant Pathology, University of Wisconsin, Madison
1970	M.S.	_____, _____, _____
1968	B.S.	_____, _____, _____

POSITIONS HELD:

Professor of Plant Pathology, Oregon State University, Corvallis, 1988-present
Associate Professor _____, _____, _____, 1984-1988
Assistant Professor _____, _____, _____, 1980-1984
Research Associate _____, _____, _____, 1976-1980

APPOINTMENT: [indicate 9 or 12 month]

FTE DISTRIBUTION:

0.25 College of Science
0.75 College of Forestry

PRINCIPAL DUTIES IN PRESENT POSITION:

Forest Pathology Research
Botany and Plant Pathology Teaching
Advisor, Biology Program

Informal Continuing Education, Forestry

OTHER OSU PROGRAM AND DEPARTMENT AFFILIATIONS:

Department of Forest Science, Adjunct Professor
Biology Program, Advisor

B. TEACHING, ADVISING AND OTHER ASSIGNMENTS

1. INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMARY

a. **CREDIT COURSES:** [list chronologically]

CREDIT COURSES:

Course Number	Name of Course	Term/Year	# of students	% Responsibility
Bot 101	Botany: A Human Concern	Fall 1992	865	50
Bot 341	Plant Ecology	Spring 1993	598	25
Bot 616	Forest Pathology	Spring 1996	14	100

Guest Lectures

b. **NON-CREDIT COURSES AND WORKSHOPS**

[list chronologically, indicate your role]

Continuing education:

Small Woodland Owners Short Course, Corvallis, 1993 (guest speaker)

Workshop on Molecular Literacy for Forest Pest Management Professionals. Corvallis, 1994. (organizer, with graduate students; lecturer)

c. **CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

[course development, curriculum committee work, with dates]

Course development:

GS 523 (now BI 523), Numerical Methods in Environmental Science.
First taught in Spring 1990.

Curriculum committee service:

1991-present. Environmental Sciences Interdisciplinary Degrees Committee, College of Science.

d. STUDENTS AND POSTDOCTORAL TRAINEES

Graduate theses directed: [name, degree, year, department]

Philip B. Hamm, M.S. 1980, Botany and Plant Pathology

Thesis title: Morphological variation, taxonomy, and host specificity of *Phytophthora megasperma*

Current Employment: OSU Extension Specialist at the Hermiston Agricultural Research & Extension Center, Hermiston, OR

Current students:

Tina Dreisbach, Ph.D. expected 1997, Botany and Plant Pathology

Minor Professor and Graduate Committee Memberships:

Kelly Sullivan, M.S., 1993, Forest Science

Graduate School Representatives:

Lailiang Cheng, Ph.D. expected 1999, Horticulture

Post-Doctoral Supervision:

Dr. Jeffrey Stone, 1990-1993

Undergraduate Students Research Supervised

Janet Brown, HHMI Summer Scholarship, 2005

e. TEAM OR COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS IN INSTRUCTION

f. INTERNATIONAL TEACHING [LOCATION, DATE, NATURE OF TEACHING]

Kathmandu, Nepal, 1984-85, teaching ecology to graduate students.

2. STUDENT AND PARTICIPANT/CLIENT EVALUATION

STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARY: (On scale of 6.0)

Course	BOT 101 Spring				BOT 525 Spring		College comparative scores
	1988	1989	1990	1992	1990	1991	
Year	1988	1989	1990	1992	1990	1991	
Number of evaluation responses	231	198	237	276	11	6	
Course objectives and requirements clearly presented							
Well prepared and organized							

Material explained clearly							
Sensitive to students' ability to understand material							
Stimulated enthusiasm for the subject							
Scheduled office hours and was available for consultation							
Fair and impartial							
Encouraged students to think for themselves							
Examinations relevant to reading assignments and material presented							
Good communications skills							
Student learned significant new ideas or skills							
Overall, favorably impressed							
Combined Total Score							

3. PEER TEACHING EVALUATIONS (to be added by Department P & T Committee)

4. ADVISING (only if the candidate has a formal advising appointment)

Undergraduate Advising:

10-15 Biology majors annually, 1985-present
 Faculty advisor, Botany Club, 1996

4. OTHER ASSIGNMENTS [describe the activity and number of persons served; provide summary of evaluations]

C. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

1. MAJOR AREAS OF CURRENT RESEARCH: [One paragraph]

2. **PUBLICATIONS:** [Categories will differ for different positions; present categories in this order, with items in chronological order; state authorship as in the journal; give full title of journals, divide into before and after joining OSU]

H-index of citations

Source:

Search:

Total citations:

Cited Publications

H-index:

Summary of numbers of publications

Number of publications: 45 total; 20 peer-reviewed journal publications, 5 book chapters since joining OSU

Key to Candidate's contributions

1. **First author:** Primary person responsible for initiation and development of project, collection of data, implementation of analysis, writing and preparation of manuscript for publication. Most of the work was conducted under my direction with students and researchers in my laboratory or as senior guide to the project in which advising was a major component.
2. **Co-first author and/or contributed equally:** Shared responsibility for initiation and development of project, collection of data, implementation of analysis, writing and preparation of manuscript for publication. A large portion of the work was conducted under my direction with students and researchers in my laboratory or as senior guide to the project in which advising was a major component.
3. **Senior or corresponding author:** Primary person responsible for initiation and development of project, collection of data, implementation of analysis, writing and preparation of manuscript for publication. Most of the work was conducted under my direction with students and researchers in my laboratory or as senior guide to the project in which advising was a major component.
4. **Published as part of a consortium/project:** Primary person responsible for task based initiation and development of project, collection of data, implementation of analysis, contribution to writing and preparation of manuscript for publication. For a given task in the work was conducted either by me and/or under my direction with students and researchers in my laboratory or as senior guide to the project in which advising was a major component.
5. **Co-Senior author/project PI/co-PI with students and researchers in my lab in which advising was a major component:** Shared responsibility for initiation and development of project, collection of data, implementation of analysis, writing and preparation of manuscript for publication. A large portion of the work was conducted under my direction with students and researchers in my laboratory or as senior guide to the project in which advising was a major component.
6. **Secondary author with students and researchers in my lab in which advising was a major component:** Significant contribution to the project design and development, collection of data, bioinformatics and other analysis, writing and preparation of manuscript for publication.
7. **Secondary author in collaboration with researchers in other laboratories in which advising was not a major component:** Significant contribution to the project design and development, collection of data, bioinformatics and other analysis, writing and preparation of manuscript for publication.

- * Graduate student
 - \$ Undergraduate student
 - ** Post-doctoral scholar
 - # Faculty Research Assistant
 - ^ Consultant
- Name (in bold letters)**

a. REFEREED PEER- REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLES

Hansen, E.M. and R.F. Patton. 1975. Types of germination and differentiation of vesicles by basidiospores of *Cronartium ribicola*. *Phytopathology* 65:1061-1071.

b. TECHNICAL REPORTS (not refereed)

Hansen, E.M. 1975. *Phellinus* (*Poria*) *weirii* root rot in Douglas-fir-alder stands 10-17 years old. USDA Forest Service Research Note. PNW-250. 5 p.

c. BOOKS

Hamm, P.B., S.J. Campbell, and E.M. Hansen (eds). 1990. Growing Healthy Seedlings. Forest Research Laboratory, Oregon State University, Corvallis. 119 p.

d. CHAPTERS IN BOOKS

Hansen, E.M. 1978. Seedling Diseases. Pages 198-200, in B.D. Cleary. (ed.), Regenerating Oregon's Forests. Oregon State University Extension Service, Corvallis.

e. ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Hansen, E.M. 1976. Potential of *Phytophthora* on coniferous nursery stock for survival and damage in the forest. Proceedings of the Western International Forest Disease Work Conference 24:81-84.

f. MANUSCRIPTS IN REVIEW/REVISION

g. ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS PRESENTED AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS:

Hansen, E.M. and R.F. Patton. 1974. Basidiospore germination and infection behavior of *Cronartium ribicola*. Proceedings of the American Phytopathological Society 1:61-62.

h. DATABASES, PROJECT WEBSITES AND SOFTWARE

3. PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS AND SEMINARS:

Summary of total numbers

a. International Audiences (denote contribution)

VIII IUFRO Conference on Root and Butt Rot in Forest Trees, "Somatic incompatibility in *Heterobasidion annosum* and *Phellinus weirii*," Uppsala, Sweden, 1993. (Invited Speaker).

b. National and Regional Audiences (denote contribution)

Eastern regional Conference on Soil Fungi (ERCERIM), "Current status of the taxonomy of *Phytophthora megasperma*," Madison, WI, 1993

c. Departmental Audiences (denote contribution)

Botany and Plant Pathology Seminar, Oregon State University, " Fungal individualism", 1991 (Presenter).

4. GRANT AND CONTRACT SUPPORT:

1. Current Support

Project:

Source:

PI:

CoPis:

Duration:

Total Funds: OSU contracts \$ (\$ total primary award to _____)

2. Pending support

5. PATENTS, CULTIVAR RELEASES, INVENTIONS [title, date]

6. COLLABORATIONS

7. OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITY

SABBATICAL LEAVE: [predominantly for research]

British Forestry Commission and University College of North Wales (1983-84)

D. SERVICE

1. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

University Committees:

Promotion & Tenure Committee, 1993-96

College Committees:

McDonald-Dunn Forest Advisory Committee, 1986-present; Planning Team 1992

Departmental Committees:

Departmental Seminars, 1985, 1993

2. SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION

Professional Societies: [membership, activity, service]

American Phytopathological Society - (1968-present)

Annual Meeting 1969, 1972,....

Associate Editor, Phytopathology, 1985-1988

Panels, Review and Planning Teams:

Methyl Bromide Alternatives Workshop, USDA, Arlington, VA, 1993.

Manuscript and Proposal Reviews: [source, year, and number]

Phytopathology 1994-2, 1993-4; Mycologia 1989-2, 1993-1.

USDA Competitive Grants 1993-3;

Private Consulting:

Weyerhaeuser Corporation, 1985

3. PROFESSIONALLY-RELATED SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC

Science presentations in the public schools - Mountain View (Corvallis) 1989

4. PUBLIC OUTREACH

Social media:

Television/Radio:

Newspapers and magazines:

Press releases:

E. AWARDS

[name, reason, organization, date]

1. National and International

Fellow, American Phytopathological Society, 1994

Fulbright professorship, Nepal, 1984-85

2. State and Regional

3. University

Carter Award for Undergraduate Teaching, College of Science, Oregon State University, 1988

Earl Price Award for Excellence in Research, College of Agricultural Sciences, Oregon State University, 1995

4. Community [where relevant]

**C. PROCEDURES, LETTERS AND FORMS,
FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING AND ADVISING**

Schedule

During Winter Term, identify faculty likely to seek promotion in the next year, select classes to be reviewed and, using class lists from previous years, students to be contacted. Appoint and charge peer teaching review teams.

During Summer- send questionnaire to students in classes taught:

Selection of Classes and Students

Select specific classes for review from among those taught in the previous 2 years.

Select 3 classes for faculty teaching 3 or more classes a year, 2 for those averaging 2 classes a year, and 1 for those averaging 1 or fewer classes a year. Sample each of the different classes regularly taught by the instructor.

Seek returned questionnaires from 10 students in each class. In large classes 30 questionnaires are mailed.

For undergraduate classes (100-400 level):

Draw the student sample from those who obtained a final grade of "C" or better.

For graduate classes (500 and 600 levels):

Draw the sample from all currently registered graduate students, with preference for those nearing the end of their programs.

TEACHING EVALUATION FOR DR. XX

Date

Address

Dear Student,

The Department of Botany and Plant Pathology requests your assistance in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of xxxxxxxx who was your instructor in BOT xxxxx, Date. This evaluation is part of a continuing process by which faculty are reviewed for promotion. Please help us by providing your thoughts on the contributions of xxxxxx to your education. Because of the nature of this request, it should be treated as confidential.

To facilitate the evaluation process, a questionnaire for each class is enclosed. Please circle the appropriate response for each of the questions. We also encourage you to add written comments to elaborate on the reasons for your ratings. Such comments are particularly valuable in helping us to understand how Dr. xxx's teaching has contributed to your overall learning experience at OSU. You may not recall the details of a particular class, but what lasting impressions were made?

We cannot use anonymous input, so please be sure to sign your name in the space provided on the back of the questionnaire. Your evaluation will become part of the promotion file of xxxxxxxx, and it will be available to the faculty and students responsible for making the Department's recommendation for promotion. It will also be available to xxxxxx, should she/he ask to see it. However, the only document that is routinely provided to a candidate for promotion is a written summary of responses to the questionnaire, and the names of individuals from whom responses were received are not included in this summary.

We need your comments by xxxxxx. Please mail the enclosed form to xxxxxxxx in the envelope provided, or deliver by hand to Dianne Simpson in the Botany and Plant Pathology Office, Cordley 2082.

Thank you for assisting us with this important task and for helping us assure the quality of education at OSU.

Sincerely,

Associate Chair, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology
Phone: (541) 737-xxxx Email:

TEACHING EVALUATION

Please rate this instructor in the following measures of teaching effectiveness. For each category below, circle a score that corresponds with the following statements:

1. Outstanding. I was stimulated to learn beyond my expectations.
2. Very Good. This instructor was very good in this area and made learning easy for me.
3. Adequate. The instructor's teaching allowed me to learn.
4. Weak. I learned in this class, despite the instructor's weaknesses in this area.
5. Inadequate. The instructor's inadequacies in this area interfered with my learning.

- I. Professionalism. An effective teacher is knowledgeable, well prepared, and organized. Class objectives and requirements are appropriate and clearly presented. The instructor invests the energy necessary to present a good class. The instructor challenges students to excel, to think independently about the subject, and to take pride and care in their work. The instructor assigns grades that reflect performance of students in the class.

1	2	3	4	5
Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Weak	Inadequate

If you wish, please provide an example of your reasons for this rating.

- II. Communication. An effective teacher presents information in a clear and understandable manner. The instructor is sensitive to the range of learning levels and styles of the students. The instructor generates enthusiasm for the subject, provides timely feedback on class performance that enhances learning, and is reasonably available for consultation with students.

1	2	3	4	5
Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Weak	Inadequate

If you wish, please provide an example of your reasons for this rating.

- III. All things considered, the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor was:

1	2	3	4	5
Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Weak	Inadequate

- IV. When you think about this instructor and this class, what things stand out in your mind?

**PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES
FOR EVALUATION OF GRADUATE STUDENT ADVISING**

Overview

Faculty effectiveness as Major Professor for MS and PhD students will be evaluated through letters solicited from all of the candidate's current and former graduate students. The evaluation will be conducted and reported by the peer teaching review team assigned to review teaching and advising activities of the candidate in the year of consideration for promotion. Letters will be solicited in the Summer after the preliminary vote by the Department P&T committee.

Selection of Students

Letters will be solicited from all current graduate students, and from all students enrolled since the last promotion. Letters will be automatically solicited from students for whom the candidate served as major professor. Candidates may add names (and addresses) of other graduate students and post-docs, as they see fit.

University guidelines require half of the letters that evaluate teaching and advising should be from a list supplied by the candidate and half from a list generated by the unit.

Sample Letter

Date

Dear (Student),

The Department of Botany and Plant Pathology is considering Dr. XXX for promotion to Professor (Courtesy). As part of our evaluation, we are seeking input from Dr. XXX's current and former graduate students. We want to know if he is/was an effective major professor for you. Please write us a short letter of evaluation to help in our deliberations. Attributes of an effective major professor that you might address include: communication skills; availability; knowledge; integrity and professionalism; and willingness to offer constructive, timely, and useful guidance and support. We need your letter by YYY.

Dr. XXX has waived his right of access to letters of evaluation solicited during the promotion review process and your letter will be held in confidence unless mandated otherwise in legal proceedings. We cannot use anonymous input so please be sure to sign your name. Thank you for your time on this important matter.

OR

Thank you for assisting us with this important task. We cannot use anonymous input, so please be sure to sign your name. Your evaluation will become part of the Promotion file, and is available to the faculty and students responsible for this Department's promotion recommendation, including Dr. XX, should he/she ask to see it. Our final evaluation of teaching effectiveness, however, will include only a summary of the responses, and will not mention names of any contributor.

Sincerely,

Chair, P&T Executive Committee/Associate Chairperson