**COE Promotion & Tenure Dossier Format**

**Notes to candidate**

Items highlighted in yellow indicate where editing is needed. Don’t delete the non-highlighted headings and text, since they are required elements.

Don’t edit the table-of-contents manually; instead, let Word update it automatically. When you’ve made all your changes, select any portion of the table-of-contents (it will turn gray). Go to the Reference tab and choose “Update Table” from the Table-Of-Contents pane and hit “okay”.

In the vitae portion of the dossier, example contents show the formatting to be used in describing different types of achievements. The comments explain what should be included in each section and how elements should be ordered. In particular, please note:

* Be sure to list explicitly what your contribution was to each joint-authored paper. This is not just a COE requirement – the Provost’s Office issued a letter to all faculty in Fall 2010 saying “"Please also remember that when work is the product of joint effort and is presented as evidence of scholarship, clarification of the candidate’s role in the joint effort should be provided in the dossier.” If you leave this out, it will be assumed that your role was minor.
* In order for conference pubs to be considered as significantly competitive, you’ll need to include the acceptance rate as part of the entry. Otherwise it will be assumed that a majority of submissions were accepted.
* In the external funding table, list any grant or contract where you were PI or coPI, even if it was at a former institution (just as you list all publications, not just those since arriving at OSU).
* Any donation must include an approximate $ value. This can be the full market value (list price) of purchase, prior to any educational or other discounts.
* Section VIII
  + B. Teaching, Advising, and Other Assignments
    - B1.1. Credit Courses
      * List courses chronologically. Information must be completed for all courses.
    - B2. Student eSET and Participant/Client Evaluations

Show every course you’ve taught, in chronological order. If data is missing, state that – but don’t leave any courses off the list. Be sure to show separate values for the 400 and 500 level responses of joint courses. If you began teaching before Winter 2003, make a copy of the table to use for courses prior to that date. In that table, change the heading row to show that the old (#12) rather than the new (#1 and #2) comparisons were in effect. College median scores are not needed.

For courses taught from Spring 2020 through Winter 2022, it is at the faculty member’s discretion to use Electronic Student Evaluation of Teaching (eSET) scores in their annual periodic review of faculty materials and promotion and tenure dossiers, without prejudice. This applies to all courses, including Ecampus courses. Supervisors do not have access to eSET scores for this time period, so faculty will need to access their scores through the eSET website (<https://apa.oregonstate.edu/eset>). In lieu of eSET scores, faculty may want to provide narrative about how they modified their course(s) for remote delivery and worked with students to ensure their success.

For courses in which a faculty member opts to not include eSET scores due to COVID-19, please include the following notation: **“Course eSET scores omitted per COVID-19 accommodations recommendations.”**

In addition, the following guidance is being added to the letters being sent to external evaluators: *OSU has provided* [*COVID-19 accommodation for academic faculty*](https://facultyaffairs.oregonstate.edu/academic-faculty-covid-19-accommodations-and-resources) *including (a) COVID-19 tenure clock extension to all tenure-track faculty upon request; (b) the inclusion of a COVID-19 impact statement in the dossier at the faculty member’s discretion; and (c) optional inclusion of Student Evaluation of Teaching scores in promotion and tenure dossiers for courses taught in Spring 2020 through Winter 2022. Evaluators and reviewers should assess the candidate’s accomplishments and productivity and provide an evaluation of the merits of the dossier without prejudice related to COVID-19 tenure clock extensions and without prejudice related to the candidate’s decision about reporting or not reporting student feedback for the Spring 2020 to Winter 2022 terms. Reviewers should also be mindful of impacts that may have been noted in the COVID-19 impact statements.*

B3. Advising

B3.1. Graduate Advisees - Completed

List names of co-advisors, if any.

Note Ph.D. students’ status (candidacy, etc.)

B3.2. Graduate Advisees - Current

List Ph.D. students first, then MS. Don’t include MEng students (they go in B3.3). If student is only part-time, indicate that after the name.

B3.3. Graduate Thesis or Project Committees

Clearly separate graduated from current. List name, degree, year (if completed), and unit. Omit any subsections that don’t apply.

B3.4. Undergraduate Research Assistants

List formal assistantships (paid) only, including name and year.

C. Scholarship and Creative Activity

*(Identify number of publications in current role (e.g., 10 in current role).*

C1. Publications

May be formatted in styles accepted by the large professional organizations in your field, as long as elements include all authors, date, pages, and (if a joint publication) candidate’s contribution. Entries in each section should re-start numbering from 1, with most recent publications appearing first.

C1.3. Peer-Reviewed Archival Conference Publications

Must include page numbers.

C1.4. Other Peer-Reviewed Publications

Cite page numbers when applicable otherwise list in the total page count.

C3. Grant and Contract Support

Show most recent first

List the PI first, then the CoPIs (just like an authors’ list for publications).

Title of the project. Gifts should be listed in C3.1. Funds earned for graduate student fellowships should be listed in Section C3.2.

D. Service

D3 Service to the Public

Include any service-related roles outside the University or professional organizations.

F. Awards

List any formal awards or prizes. Do not list membership in clubs, societies, or honoraries.

Section X. Other Letters and Materials

*(This section is to be used for adding significant contributions to dossier after the candidate has certified that the open part of the dossier is complete (Section XI). No changes can be made to any section of the open part of the dossier.)*

Section XI. Candidate’s Statement that File is Complete

*(Prior to the dossier receiving its first formal review by the unit promotion and tenure committee, the candidate should sign this 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.)*

Before turning in your dossier, accept all changes. Leave the highlighting in place for the unit.

In addition to the MSWord copy of your dossier, submit signed copies of (a) the waiver page (Section III) and (b) the statement saying your portions of the dossier are complete (Section XI). Section X can be used for adding significant contributions to dossier after the candidate has certified that the open part of the dossier is complete. *(Section III must be completed prior to sending student and external letter requests and Section IX must be signed prior to the first formal review by the unit P&T Committee).*

**Notes to unit**

Please submit dossiers using just this format. Items highlighted in cyan indicate where unit editing and additions are needed. Note that the University now requires explicit information about the process used for student and external evaluations, as well as the process used to form the unit and College-level committees.

* You will also be inserting scanned copies of the signed letters.
* Replace the “dummy pages” with signed copies (position description, signed waiver, student letter, peer teaching letter, unit committee letter, unit head letter, external letters, dossier completeness statement). Don’t worry if a signed item occupies more than one page.
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Section X. Other Letters and Materials (optional)

Section XI. Candidate’s Statement that File is Complete

# Section II. Form A (rev. 7/1/2022)

**Cover Form — Candidate's Dossier**

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Name:  **Jill Q. Smith**

Department:  **School of Widget Design and Engineering**

College: **Engineering**

Nature of Recommendation

Promotion to rank of **Associate Professor**

Change in tenure status to **Indefinite Tenure**

Has candidate been reviewed for this change before?  Yes  No

If yes, provide date of previous review \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate's Current Status

Current Rank (if applicable): **Assistant Professor**

Administrative or Professional title: **Assistant Professor**

Annual appointment FTE: FTE \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annual tenure appointment FTE: FTE \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annual appointment length (check either 9 or 12 month):  9 mo.  12 mo.

Tenure (if indefinite tenure, year granted): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date present rank began at OSU **September 16, 2012**

Date probationary period toward tenure began (for tenure track appointments) **September 16, 2012**

Date by which a tenure/Letter of Timely decision must be made: **June 15, 2016**

Years of Service

Years of prior probationary service considered – include only for individuals being reviewed for indefinite tenure

(attach Letter of Offer specifying credit for prior service) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Service at OSU:

a. Years of full time service at OSU **5**

b. Years of part time service as OSU **0**

Total years of service at OSU (a + b) **5**

Checklist

**Cover page with table of contents**

**Form A and Checklist**. (please do not attach a photo of the candidate)

**Optional “Waiver of Access” for current year** (previous waivers are not valid for current year)

*If the candidate did not sign a waiver, please include a statement indicating this decision.*

**Position Description** (current and prior, as appropriate)

**Candidate’s Statement**

**Student Committee/Client Letter of Evaluation**

**Peer Review of Teaching Committee Letter of Evaluation**

**Administrative Letters of Evaluation**

Department Faculty Committee Letter

Department Chair or Department Head Letter

Rebuttal Letter (if any)

Letters from Other Administrators with Supervisory Responsibility

College or Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee’s Letter

Dean, Director, Vice Provost, or Vice President’s Letter

Rebuttal Letter (if any)

**Promotion and Tenure Vita**

Education and Employment Information

Teaching, Advising, and Other Assignments

Instructional Summary

Credit Courses

Noncredit Courses and Workshops

Curriculum Development

Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Trainees

Team or Collaborative Efforts

International Teaching

Student and Participant Evaluation Summary

Advising

Other Assignments

Scholarship and Creative Activity

Publications

Invited and Peer Selected Presentations

Grants and Contracts (identify the PI and candidate’s role)

Patent Awards/Inventions

Service

Department Service

College Service

University Service

Service to Profession

Service to the Public (professionally related)

Service to the Public (non-professionally related)

Awards

National and International

State and Regional

University and Community

**Contributions to University’s EDI Goals**

**Letters of Evaluation**

Brief description of outside evaluators (indicate clearly which reviewers were selected from the names submitted by the candidate)

Sample letter from Department Chair/Head requesting letter of evaluation (candidates must not solicit letters on their own behalf)

Log of telephone or personal contacts with external reviewers

Solicited letters of evaluation from outside leaders in the field (6 minimum, 8 maximum for most faculty)

**Candidate’s Statement**

Candidate’s signed statement that file is complete prior to review by the department

ADMINISTRATORS RESPONSIBLE FOR PRESENTATION OF THE DOSSIER:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Jane M. Doe Scott A. Ashford, Ph.D., P.E. (California)

Head, School of WDE Kearney Dean of Engineering

## A. Letter of Offer

[Unit will replace this page with a copy of the signed letter of offer.]

# Section III. 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 Oregon State University.

OSU Standard (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 Standard 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.

**WAIVER OF ACCESS TO SUBMITTED EVALUATION MATERIALS FROM REVIEWERS**

**PLEASE SIGN ONE:**

I hereby waive, in advance, my legal right of access to see the evaluation materials requested from and submitted by reviewers both from within the University and external to it in conjunction with my dossier prepared in support of promotion and/or tenure. This includes individual student letters solicited by the department, although I retain my right of access to the summary letter written by the student committee. I understand I will retain my right of access to written evaluations prepared by my department chair or head, the personnel committee of my department and college, my dean, and the Provost and Executive Vice President. I make this waiver with full knowledge of my legal rights under Oregon law as outlined above. This waiver may be submitted to proposed reviewers.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Signature Date**

I hereby do not waive my legal right of access to see the evaluation materials requested from and submitted by reviewers both from within the University and external to it in conjunction with my current year performance evaluation.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Signature Date**

# Section IV. Position Description

[Unit will replace this page with a copy of the signed position description]

[If the position description varied during the years covered, include them all, clearly showing the dates when each applied**]**

[If there are multiple position descriptions with significant changes, please identify those changes for the current PD and for each former PD, using the format below. ]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PD dated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  [list changes/differences] | PD dated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  [list changes/differences] | PD dated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  [list changes/differences] |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Section V. Candidate’s Statement

**PART A:** The candidate should include a statement (three page maximum, single-spaced, 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. Be sure to cover any accomplishments that may not be obvious from the CV, as well as planned future activities.

**PART B:** An optional COVID-19 impact statement may be included (one page maximum, 12-point font, one-inch margins). This statement is in addition to the 3-page candidate statement and does not impact the length of that statement. COVID-19 impact statements describe the impact of the pandemic on the ability to perform duties in the position description. Impacts may include the following examples: personal circumstances that impede work, lack of access to research facilities and sites, inability to collect data, publication delays, cancelled conferences and seminars, or other circumstances attributable to the changed landscape of working under pandemic conditions.

# Section VI. Student Letter of Evaluation and

# Peer Review of Teaching

## A. Process Used to Identify Student Committee

[This information will be provided by the unit]

## B. Sample Letter of Instructions to Students

[This information will be provided by the unit]

## C. Summary Letter from Student Committee

[Unit will replace this page with a copy of the signed letter]

## D. Peer Teaching Evaluations

[Unit will replace this page with peer teaching evaluations]

# Section VII. Administrative Letters of Evaluation

## A. Process Used to Form Faculty Committee

[This information will be provided by the unit]

## B. Unit Faculty Committee’s Letter

[Unit will replace this page with a copy of the signed letter]

## C. Unit Head’s Letter

[Unit will replace this page with a copy of the signed letter]

## D. Rebuttal Letter (if any)

[Unit will replace this page with a copy of the signed letter, if there is one]

## E. Process Used to Form College Committee

[This information will be provided by the College]

## F. College Committee’s Letter

[College will replace this page with a copy of the signed letter]

## G. Dean’s Letter

[College will replace this page with a copy of the signed letter]

## H. Rebuttal Letter (if any)

[College will replace this page with a copy of the signed letter, if there is one]

# Section VIII. Promotion and Tenure Vita

## A. Education and Employment Information

### A1. Education

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2002 | Ph.D., Gizmo Design  State Institute of Technology  Advisor: Thomas Edison |
| 1994 | B.S., Widget Engineering  University of Who Knows What |

### A2. Professional Experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sept. 2006−present | Assistant Professor  School/Department of XXX  Oregon State University |
| Jan 2003-Aug 2004 | Postdoctoral Fellow  Department of Widget Integration  Kazoo University |
| date−date | Position  Employer and location |

## B. Teaching, Advising, and Other Assignments

### B1. Instructional Summary

#### B1.1. Credit Courses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number** | **Course Title** | **Term/Year** | **Credits** | **Enrollment** |
| CS300 | Intermediate Assemblers | Fall 2001 | 4 | 22 |
| CS261 | Data Structures | Spring 2002 | 4 | 49 |
| CS420/520 | Intro. to Database Systems | Fall 2002 | 4 | 49 |
| CS580 | Compiler Construction | Winter 2003 | 4 | 14 |
| CS420/520 | Intro. to Database Systems | Spring2003 | 4 | 61 |
| CS261 | Data Structures | Fall 2003 | 4 | 86 |
| CS420/520 | Intro. to Database Systems | Spring 2004 | 4 | 41 |
| CS582 | Computer Architecture | Fall 2003 | 4 | 11 |
| CS 250 | Data Structures | Fall 2004 | 4 | 80 |
| CS419/519 | Special Topics: Parallel Computing | Fall 2004 | 4 | 34 |
| CS580 | Compiler Construction | Spring 2005 | 4 | 19 |
| CS261 | Data Structures | Fall 2005 | 4 | 107 |
| CS580 | Compiler Construction | Fall 2005 | 4 | 68 |
| CS451/551 | Distributed Systems | Winter 2006 | 4 | 100 |

#### B1.2. Non-Credit Courses and Workshops

none

#### B1.3. Course and Curriculum Development

Use this area to describe your activities in developing or restructuring course content, and in developing curriculum (series of related courses), including implementation of innovative instructional practices. Don’t include things that are expected of every teacher in every course, such as updating course objectives or switching to a new textbook. Format each example as a separate paragraph, beginning with a boldfaced phrase serving as a title, as shown.

#### B1.4. Team or Collaborative Efforts

none

#### B1.5. International Teaching

none

### B2. Student (eSET) and Participant/Client Evaluations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course No. (credits)** | **Term** | **Enroll-ment** | **# Re-sponding** | **Student**  **Evaluation (#1/#2)** | **Required**  **/Elective** |
| CS 221 (4) | Spring 2003 | 78 | 41 | 4.0/4.5 | Elective |
| CS 451/551 (4) | Fall 2003 | 13 | 7 | 4.0/4.3 (401)  5.0/5.5 (501) | Required |
| CS 559 (3) | Fall 2003 | 10 | 10 | 5.0/5.0 | Elective |

### B3. Advising

#### B3.1. Graduate Advisees – Completed

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student** | **Degree** | **Thesis** | **Graduated** |
| * 1. Jill Smith | MS | *On Improving the Performance of a Mechanical Gizmo* | Summer 2006 |
| * 1. Joe Jones | PhD | *On Analyzing the Performance of an Electrical Widget* | Spring 2006 |
| * 1. Susan Nguyen | MS | *On Improving the Safety of a Bridge* | Spring 2005 |
| * 1. Mike Wang | MS | *Enhanced Chemical Process Control* | Spring 2005 |

#### B3.2. Graduate Advisees – Current

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student** | **Degree** | **Expected Graduation** | **Advanced to Candidacy (Y/N)** |
| 1. Mohammad Ali | PhD | Summer 2011 | Y |
| 1. Mikhail Gorbachev | PhD | Spring 2010 | N |
| 1. Margaret Thatcher | PhD | Spring 2010 | Y |
| 1. Napoleon Bonapart | MS | Spring 2009 | -- |
| 1. Madeline Albright | MS | Winter 2009 | -- |

#### B3.3. Graduate Thesis or Project Committees

**MEng Advisor:**

***Graduated***

1. GeorgeWashington, MEng, 2005
2. Jack Adams, MEng, 2008

***Current***

1. Martha Washington, MEng

**Minor Professor or Committee Member:**

***Graduated***

1. Thomas Jefferson, PhD, 2006
2. Dolly Madison, MS, 2006
3. Sally Ride, Undergraduate University Honors Thesis, 2005
4. Benjamin Franklin, MS, 2005

***Current***

1. Charlie Brown, PhD
2. Hank Aaron, MS
3. Connie Wright, PhD (Civil Engineering)
4. Denise Peters, PhD (Mechanical Engineering)

**Graduate Council Representative:**

1. Mike Mark, PhD, 2004 (Mechanical Engineering)
2. Luke Francis, MS, 2004 (Forest Science)
3. Yin Yang, MS, 2003 (Civil Engineering)

#### B3.4. Undergraduate Research Assistants

1. Sunita Agrawal (Winter 2004 - Fall 2006)
2. Bob Pitts (Spring 2004 - Fall2006)
3. Anna Farm (Fall 2003)
4. Priscilla Frisbie (Fall 2006 - present)

#### B3.5. Postdoctoral Trainees

1. Thomas Jefferson, PhD, 2006

#### B3.6. Other Advising

**Faculty Sponsor, Association for Computing Machinery student chapter**, Fall 2003-present. During this period the group reinstituted participation in the National Student Programming Competition.

Describe any other formal advising/sponsor roles

### B4. Other Assignments

None

## C. Scholarship and Creative Activity

### C1. Publications

The candidate’s role on joint publications is indicated as part of each entry; if nothing has been included, the candidate’s involvement was minor. **The candidate should indicate in bold font students for which the candidate serves as a major advisor**.

#### C1.1. Books & Book Chapters

1. J. Smith, J. Jones and M. Michaels. “How to build a widget.” Accepted for publication *in Novel Construction Techniques* (primary author)

#### C1.2. Refereed Journal Publications

1. J. Smith, J. Jones and M. Michaels, How to Build a Widget, Part I, *Journal of Widgets*, 18 (5), 2001, pp. 58-69. (primary author)

#### C1.3. Peer-Reviewed Archival Conference Publications

The following papers appeared in archival proceedings that were distributed to libraries (the next section covers other types of proceedings). The acceptance rate is indicated as part of the entry whenever the selection process was rigorous.

1. J. Jones, J. Smith and M. Michaels, Preliminary Results on Building Widgets, *Proceedings of 16th International Conference on Widget Methodology, Seattle WA, January 2001*, pp. 501-509 (provided initial idea; 28% acceptance rate).

#### C1.4. Other Peer-Reviewed Publications

The following papers appeared in proceedings that were distributed primarily to attendees (as CDs, printed volumes, availability through a public website, etc.).

1. J. Smith, J. Jones and M. Michaels, How to Build a Widget That Really Works, *Workshop on Widget Construction and Use, Denver CO, December 2001* (contributed text & supplied data).

#### C1.5. Papers Currently under Peer Review

1. J. Smith, How to Build a Widget, Part II, *Journal of Widgets*.

#### C1.6. Other Publications

List other scholarly publications.

### C2. Professional Meetings, Symposia, and Conferences

#### C2.1. Presentations to Professional Groups (includes presentations of papers cited in C1.3)

* Invited Talk, Auburn University, “Designing Widgets,” August 2006
* Invited Talk, Portland State University, “Methodology for Widget Design,” May 2006
* Contributed Talk, *16th International Conference on Widget Methodology, Seattle WA* “Preliminary Results on Building Widgets,” January 2001

#### C2.2. Participation at Invitational Workshops

* Broadening Participation in Gizmo and Widget Design, National Science Foundation, May 2006

### C3. Grant and Contract Support

List covers grants/contracts on which candidate served as PI or coPI only, including those funded through other institutions. “My share” indicates the amount of funding, if any, over which the candidate had control.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Agency & Dates* | *PI (and coPIs)* | *Title* | *Total Budget* | *My Share* |
| Intel Foundation  2/10-1/12 | J. Jones, M. Michaels, J.Smith | Computer Graphics Education Lab | $123,440 | $45,000 |
| NSF  9/08-8/10 | J. Smith | Research Experiences for Undergraduates Supplement to CAREER: Understanding the Complexities of Animating Gizmos | $12,000 | $12,000 |
| DARPA  6/07-5/09 | J. Smith, J. Jones and M. Michaels | Integrated Widget Design: A Decision Theoretic Approach | $1,651,108 | $375,220 |
| NSF  3/03-2/04 | J. Smith (while I was at Kazoo University) | Understanding the Complexities of Animating Gizmos (CAREER award) | $493,672 | $493,672 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Totals* | | | $2,290,220 | $935,892 |

**C3.1. Funding for Graduate Student Fellowships**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Year* | *Fellowship* | *Student Name* | *Approx. Value* |
| 2020 | NSF GRF | Jill Smith | $85,000 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**C3.2. Donations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Year* | *Source* | *Donation* | *Approx Value* |
| 2008 | Gizmos, Inc. | Laboratory equipment for gizmo design | $15,000 |
| 2010 | Gizmos R Us, Inc. | TanTool software for use in undergraduate project course | $8,000 |
|  |  |  |  |

#### C3.3. Proposals Currently under Review

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Agency* | *PI (and coPIs)* | *Title* | *Budget* | *Duration* |
| ONR | J. Smith and M. Michaels | Broadening Participation in Widget and Gizmo Design for K-12 | $184,000 | 3 yrs |
| NSF | J. Jones and J. Smith | IGERT: Developing an Interdisciplinary Curriculum in Widget Integration | 1,252,300 | 3 yrs |
|  |  |  |  |  |

### C4. Patents Filed and In Process

None

### C5. Other Scholarship and Creative Activities

If appropriate, describe any additional contributions that demonstrate your research accomplishments.

## D. Service

### D1. University Service

* COE Award Committee, 2005
* School Faculty Search Committee, AY04/05
* School Awards Committee, AY02/03
* School Undergraduate Committee, 2001-2002
* Faculty Senate, AY 05/06

### D2. Service to the Profession

#### D2.1. Journal Editorships

* Associate editor for widgets, *International Journal of Widgets,* 2010-present

#### D2.2. Conference and Workshop Organization

* Technical Program Co-Chair, Workshop on Gizmo Diversity, 2007

#### D2.3. Conference Program Committees

* International Symposium on Gizmo Animation, 2006
* Session Chair, International Conference on Widget Design, 2005

#### D2.4. Reviewing

* NSF Grant Review Panels
* *International Journal on Widgets and Gizmos*

#### D2.5. Other

### D3. Service to the Public

#### D3.1. Professionally Related

* **Research Demonstrations, 2003:** Responsible for the design and presentation of research demonstrations to several groups of middle school students from the community. I also gave a presentation to gifted and talented students participating in the ASE Midsummer Conference on the OSU campus.

#### D3.2. Non-Professionally Related (optional)

## E. Awards

### E1. National and International Awards

**National Science Foundation Faculty Early Career Development (CAREER) Award, 2002.** The NSF CAREER award recognizes faculty members who are “most likely to become the academic leaders of the 21st Century.”

**Fellow of the International Widget Professional Society**, 2002

### E2. State and Regional Awards

None

### E3. University or Community Awards

None

**F. Contributions to University’s DEI Goals**

The OSU Faculty Handbook states that, “Oregon State University is committed to maintaining and enhancing its collaborative and inclusive community that strives for equity and equal opportunity. All faculty members are responsible for helping to ensure that these goals are achieved.” Contributions in this area may arise through the Candidate’s research, teaching, advising, and service activities. Candidates should also indicate any professional development activities to this end.

# Section IX. Letters of Evaluation

## A. Description of Outside Evaluators

[This information will be provided by the unit

Show in this order:

Evaluators from candidate’s list, in alphabetical order

Evaluators from unit list, in alphabetical order]

## B. Sample Letter Requesting Letter of Evaluation

[This information will be provided by the unit]

## C. Log of Contacts with External Evaluators

[This information will be provided by the unit

Show in this order:

Evaluators from candidate’s list, in alphabetical order

Evaluators from unit list, in alphabetical order]

## D. Letters of Evaluation

[Unit will replace this page with copies of the signed letters

Insert in this order:

Evaluators from candidate’s list, in alphabetical order

Evaluators from unit list, in alphabetical order]

# Section X. Other Letters and Materials

# Section XI. Candidate’s Statement that File is Complete

I have reviewed the open part of the dossier, and find it to be complete and current.

Jill Q. Smith

Date