



Oregon State University **Extension Service**

Outreach Scholarship for Extension Faculty

Recommendations to CPHHS & OSU Extension



November 2017

Contents

Foreword.....	3
1. Definition and interpretation of scholarship for OSU Extension	3
2. Extension scholarship: FAQ's	4
3. Interpretations of scholarship based on type of Extension position.....	8
4. Performance standards.....	10
5. Presenting scholarship in Extension P&T dossiers	11
6. Mentoring Extension faculty for success in Scholarship and Creative Activity .	12

Appendices

A. Excerpts from the OSU Faculty Handbook	13
B. Journals that may be good candidates for publishing Extension articles	18

Foreword

Our strong commitment to community-engaged scholarship arises from Oregon State University's land-grant traditions and values. We recognize and place high importance on faculty collaboration with communities throughout the state of Oregon and beyond, to identify problems and find locally relevant and sustainable solutions. Our work as members of the Extension Scholarship Task Force has been guided by recognizing the myriad ways in which the scholarship of Extension develops and can be recognized and evaluated. The purpose of this document is to provide guidance on the expectations for Extension scholarship, in order to promote the success of Extension faculty members going through the promotion process. We recognize differences in the types of scholarship expected for tenure-line faculty and professors of practice, and we make recommendations in this document based on these distinctions.

1. Definition and interpretation of scholarship for OSU Extension

OSU's definition of scholarship:

The Promotion & Tenure guidelines in the OSU Faculty Handbook state the following (for more complete text, see Appendix A, p. 10):

"Scholarship and creative activity are understood to be intellectual work whose significance is validated by peers and which is communicated. More specifically, such work in its diverse forms must be based on a high level of professional expertise; must give evidence of originality; must be documented and validated as through peer review or critique; and must be communicated in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself. Intellectual work in *research, teaching, extension, service, or other assignments* is scholarship if it is shared with peers in journals, in formal peer-reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer-evaluated forums."

This OSU definition identifies three major criteria that constitute the hallmark of scholarly products. All must be present. Our interpretations of these criteria are as follows:

(1) "**Intellectual work...**" This refers to creative work that moves one's field forward in some way, e.g., by adding to knowledge, increasing understanding, or providing a new interpretation with regard to an issue, theory, problem, program, population, etc. For example, intellectual work can include...

- Discovery of new knowledge

- Development of new technologies, materials, methods, or educational approaches
- Integration of knowledge and/or technologies leading to new interpretations or applications

(2) “...**whose significance is validated by peers**...” Peer validation is the process that affirms the accuracy and value of the contribution. (See section 2.)

(3) “...**and which is communicated**.” Communication can take different forms, but this requirement stipulates that the intellectual work is shared back with one’s professional peers, typically outside of the OSU home institution (according to the Faculty Handbook).

2. Extension scholarship: FAQ’s

What are appropriate types of peer validation?

- **Peer referee processes.** “Referee” refers to a process whereby a product (such as a manuscript, grant proposal, etc.) is reviewed and judged by peers for purposes of making a decision about acceptance or rejection. It can occur with regard to a journal submission, conference proposal, grant proposal, or other kind of product.
- **Invitation.** An invitation to deliver a keynote presentation or contribute a chapter to a publication can generally be considered evidence of peer validation for that scholarly product. However, not all invitations provide evidence of scholarship. For example, getting invited to teach a class is usually in the realm of teaching rather than scholarship.
- **Adoption of practices by Extension peers.** If Extension professionals in other states adopt a curriculum or other product, that can be considered evidence of peer validation, because it suggests the usefulness and quality of the product.
- **Awards.** An award that is related to the candidate’s scholarship can provide evidence of the strong influence that the scholarship has had, and can be an indicator of peer validation. As stated in the guidelines for Professor of Practice (see p. 13): “...[A]wards recognizing community, professional and/or scientific achievements...are considered as evidence of peer recognition.”

How is it decided whether a particular product or activity qualifies as scholarship?

In some cases, a judgment will need to be made regarding whether a particular article, presentation, grant project, or other product/activity meets the definition of scholarship, as defined in the OSU Faculty Handbook and as interpreted via these guidelines. In those cases, the judgment is made through the successive

levels of review of the CPHHS and OSU Promotion & Tenure process: the Schools' Personnel/P&T Committees, School Heads, College P&T Committee, Dean, and Provost's office. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the individual candidate to make the case in the P&T dossier – especially in the Candidate's Statement and the Scholarship section – that the criteria for scholarship have been met. The candidate needs to address: Where is the peer validation, and where is the communication or dissemination to peers, associated with this item? We recommend that as candidates begin their careers they consider all of these features carefully and get annual verification from their mentors and other OSU advisors as to their progress toward these goals.

Table 1		
Examples – and non-examples – of outreach scholarship		
Typically qualify as scholarship (assuming that peer validation exists)	Typically do not qualify as scholarship	Might be scholarship, depending on specifics (e.g., the audience, nature of peer validation, etc.) **
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal publications (both academic or practitioner-oriented) • Extension publications that go through peer review (e.g., EESC or PNW publications) • Books (including edited books) • Book chapters • Peer-refereed conference presentations or posters • Competitive grants for research or program innovations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports to funders • Newsletter articles • Blogs • Editorials • Letters to the editor • Awards * • SNAP-Ed continuation funding • Non-competitive grants to continue an ongoing community program • Editorial position on a journal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSU Extension publications • Development of new Extension curricula • Invited conference presentations • Invited webinars • Presentations at OSU conferences • Project reports to the community

Notes:

* An award that is based on one's scholarship can be evidence of peer validation. However, the award itself is not a scholarly product.

** The third column (**Might** be scholarship) is particularly relevant for faculty members in the Professor of Practice series, since their products may go through peer validation processes that are different from standard scholarship channels.

What is *Outreach Scholarship*?

With Extension's organizational focus on outreach and engagement, the term "Outreach scholarship" has often been used to describe the kind of scholarship that is particularly relevant for Extension. Outreach scholarship "involves the creation, integration, transfer and application of knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences" (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison, 1997). Compared to more traditional forms of scholarship, outreach scholarship (also called *engagement scholarship*) places greater emphasis on working in collaborative teams, shared decision-making about topics to focus on, and dissemination outlets that target program personnel and practitioners.

For further information:

- Engagement Scholarship Consortium: <https://engagementscholarship.org/>
- Franz, Nancy K. (2011). Tips for constructing a promotion and tenure dossier that documents engaged scholarship endeavors. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15 (3), 15-29. Available at: <http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/view/571>
- Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison Council on Outreach. (1997). *Commitment to the Wisconsin idea: A guide to documenting and evaluating excellence in outreach scholarship*. Available at: https://www.secfac.wisc.edu/documents/Resource_Extension_Wisconsin-Idea.pdf

What factors determine the quality of scholarly products?

Scholarly products will vary in their significance, quality, and importance of the contribution. For example, there are different levels of rigor and selectivity among journals, professional organizations, publishers, etc. There are also different degrees of adoption of new curricula or other creative products. And there are differences in the significance of one's role in team-created scholarship. The assessments of quality, significance, and the importance of the candidate's role are made in the different stages of the P&T review process (enumerated in previous paragraph). Therefore, it is in the candidate's interest to be as clear as possible, in the dossier, regarding the significance of one's scholarship and the specific role one had in creating it.

"Several questions can be used to evaluate the quality and significance of a body of outreach scholarship:

1. Is there evidence that the program addresses an issue of significant concern and is worth of significant effort?
2. Do the outreach efforts draw upon the faculty member's disciplinary or professional expertise? Is there evidence of significant intellectual contributions to these efforts?
3. How do these activities relate to the department's mission?

4. Are there clear ties to a research base/ Does the work use both scholarly and community assessments, build on previous work, and use basic and applied theory?
5. To what extent do the activities represent potential new interpretations and applications of knowledge for use in specific settings?
6. Are there clearly focused and intended educational outcomes?
7. Is there a clear strategy to reach the desired outcomes?
8. Is there a plan to collect evidence that the program has achieved the intended outcomes?
9. Is there potential for the activities to general new research questions or make more understandable the current body of knowledge?
10. Does the outreach activity impact public policy, improve practice among professionals, or influence those involved? ...
11. To what extent do outreach activities have a multiplier effect (e.g., train trainers, build infrastructure for program continuation)?" (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison Council on Outreach. (1997), p. 3)

What constitutes scholarship with regard to grants and contracts?

- A competitive process for the funding decisions (e.g., an RFA process)
- If there was not a formal competitive process, the "peer validation" aspect must be demonstrated
- Evidence of innovation relating to the activities of the funded project
- The faculty member's role on the project. For example, being a Principal Investigator or co-Investigator on a grant project can be considered scholarship, whereas being a consultant on the project is not.

Grants and contracts spanning multiple years:

- A multi-year project will usually involve larger amounts of funding than a one-year project, and should be given more weight than a project lasting only a single year. However, the continuation application for year 2 should not be viewed as a separate grant. That is, the project as a whole should be seen as spanning the multi-year period.

Does "program impact" qualify as scholarship?

The *Guidelines for Professor of Practice Appointments and Promotion*, section V (see p. 14) state the following: "Documented impact due to local or regional adoption of practices developed through research activities is considered scholarship." This is a category of scholarship (i.e., defining it in terms of "impact due to local or regional adoption of practices developed through research activities," rather than the more standard components of peer validation and communication) that appears only in this section of the Faculty Handbook describing the Professor of Practice position. Thus, for the Professor of Practice position, the impact of local or regional adoption of improved practices, methods or programs *developed by the faculty member* can be

considered scholarship that augments publications, presentations and the other products described above.

According to this statement, only impacts that originate from the faculty member's own research efforts are considered scholarship. By contrast, the impacts of practices or programs that are *not* the result of the faculty member's own research are not considered scholarship, unless these are documented with more standard peer-validated scholarly products such as publications and presentations. Furthermore, the impact should be determined through a systematic evaluation guided by research or evaluation questions and conducted with sufficient rigor to establish the validity of the impact. Documentation of impacts that includes a counterfactual (that is, evidence that the impact would not have taken place without the program or practice) carries the greatest weight.

Example: An Extension faculty member conducts a research study to establish a new method for improving youth dietary choices, resulting in an "evidence-based" method. The faculty member then utilizes the method in a local Extension program designed to increase healthy dietary choices in youth. The faculty member also plans and conducts an evaluation of the program, measuring the dietary choices of youth before and after the program, as well as a 6-month follow-up. The evaluation results show that the youth have improved their dietary choices and are still making good choices 6 months post-program. In addition, the faculty member utilizes a comparison group of youth that shows no change in dietary choices (counterfactual evidence).

Aspects of this example that reflect impact as scholarship are as follow:

- The program is determined to be evidence-based through the faculty member's own research activities.
- The adoption of the program at the local or regional level results in changes in participant behavior that are documented through systematic program evaluation (impact).

3. Interpretations of scholarship based on type of Extension position

Scholarship expectations for campus-based specialist positions vs. county-based positions

- The scholarship of county Extension tenure-line faculty can be very applied (e.g., focusing on the work that was done and the immediate impact that it had), whereas the scholarship of Extension specialists should give more attention to issues of theory and how the current work fits into the larger knowledge base.
- Although all scholarship must involve original work (e.g., the OSU Handbook states that scholarship "...must give evidence of originality..."), the expectation and criteria for innovation will be higher for Extension specialists than for

county-based faculty. Extension specialists must make clear: how does this scholarly work advance the field?

- In terms of the communication/dissemination aspect of scholarship, county faculty can focus more on dissemination channels to the local community, i.e., those who will benefit directly from the programmatic work, whereas Extension specialists will typically focus more on dissemination to academic peers.

Scholarship expectations for tenure-line positions (campus and county) vs. Professor of Practice positions

There are often differences between tenure-line and PoP positions in the FTE allocations for scholarship (e.g., 15% vs. 10%), but the following considerations refer to basic expectations for tenure-line vs. PoP, assuming equal FTE allocations.

- Compared to PoP positions, tenure-line faculty are expected to play a greater leadership role in scholarly activities. While both may be expected to obtain grant funds, the tenure-line faculty member is expected to be engaged at a higher level with the grant and the products developed (e.g., being PI on a grant, being the lead author on a paper or presentation), rather than being a member of the project team with a lower level of engagement.
- There is a higher expectation for rigor in the scholarship of tenure-line faculty, e.g., as reflected in more selective journals, national rather than regional or state conferences, etc.
- The expectation and criteria for innovation will be relatively higher for tenure-line faculty than for PoP faculty (e.g., how does this work advance the field?).
- For Professors of Practice, as described earlier in the section on program impact (see p. 5), the OSU Handbook places relatively greater emphasis on their scholarship as a reflection of their involvement with their communities. The guidelines state (see p. 13 for full text): “The appropriateness and importance of the type of scholarship will vary with the expectations of the position...In the case of Professor of Practice faculty, emphasis is placed on peer recognition as a professional practitioner in community settings.”
- Further information on PoP:
<http://extension.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/for-employees/employee-resources/program-evaluations/professor-of-practice-frequently-asked-questions.pdf>

4. Performance standards

Scholarship activity must be assessed based on the FTE allocation in the Position Description

The specific scholarship expectations for each position are described in the Position Description, which provides a FTE percentage allocation for scholarship. For example, the Guidelines (*V. Professor of Practice Scholarship and Creative Work*, see p. 13) state: "In general, scholarly expectations for Professor of Practice faculty will be between 5 and 15% of the individual's total position expectations. This level of scholarly expectation differs from tenure track faculty positions which have relatively larger scholarly expectations." The scholarship allocation for campus-based Extension specialist positions can be as high as 40%. Therefore, judgments in the P&T process regarding satisfactory scholarship output must take account of this stated expectation.

Some level of leadership in scholarship activities must be demonstrated

Candidates for Promotion & Tenure need to show evidence of making a major contribution in some aspects of their scholarship activities – not necessarily in all of their scholarship, but in some of it at least. Examples of this "major contribution" are lead authorships, being a PI on grants, etc. By contrast, e.g., being 3rd author on every listed publication is not sufficient to meet the "major contribution" requirement. This consideration is particularly important for advancement to full rank, since full rank requires the demonstration of "distinction," but it is important for advancement to associate rank as well.

Can a "standard" scholarship expectation be identified based on a faculty member's position and FTE allocation?

The committee drafting this document takes the position that it is not productive to provide cookbook recipes for given FTE levels, with specific target numbers for publications, presentations, grant funding amounts, and so on. Instead, a variety of factors must be considered, and there must be an appropriate balance of publications, presentations, grants, curricula, and other kinds of scholarly products, and among most prestigious journals and conferences. Similarly, the expectations for leadership in scholarly activity – as reflected in lead or sole authorships, PI status on grants, team membership, etc. – will depend on the work assignments, the scholarship allocations, and other criteria described in the Position Description. In sum, the overall quality of a scholarship record depends on the total picture, and must be assessed in terms of its relationship to the type of programmatic activity, the level of innovation and significance of specific scholarly products, and other considerations.

5. Presenting scholarship in Extension P&T dossiers

The Scholarship part of the dossier should be organized into the following major sections. After the dossier has been submitted for P&T review, updates can be submitted at any time during the review process. For example, an update could indicate that a paper under review has been accepted, or that an “in press” publication has been published.

- **Publications**
 - Publications should be listed in reverse chronological order (most recent first)
 - Recommended sub-sections are as follows:
 - Peer refereed articles
 - Books and book chapters
 - Technical reports
 - Other publications
- **Presentations**
 - Includes conference presentations (both refereed and invited) and posters. (For invited presentations, provide evidence of peer validation, as per Table 1, p. 5.)
 - Recommended sub-sections:
 - International
 - National
 - Regional
 - State & local
- **Grants**
 - Recommended sub-sections:
 - Funded
 - Under current review
- **Curricula**
- **Other creative products**
 - Juried exhibits, etc.

Sequencing and presentation of information

Publications

- Journal publications should be listed in reverse chronological order (most recent first). They should not be organized according to the journal name.
- Dossiers should include papers that have already been accepted for publication but have not yet been published. Instead of the date, they can be labeled “in press.” These papers should appear first in the reverse chronological list.

- Dossiers can include manuscripts that are currently under review, listed under a separate heading. The listing should include the journal to which the submission was made and the date (month, year) of the submission.
- Dossiers should not include a list of manuscripts in preparation that have not been accepted, or at least submitted, for publication.

Grants and contracts

- The entries for grants and contracts should provide the following information: Title of project; Funder; Time frame (or dates); Amount; Candidate's position on the project (PI, co-I, etc.)
- Candidates, at their own discretion, can decide whether to list proposals that were submitted but not funded. A project that hasn't been funded, while it does not count as a scholarly product, can provide evidence of the candidate's activity in this area and can provide context for the candidate's further grant activity.

6. Mentoring Extension faculty for success in scholarship

In the College of Public Health and Human Sciences, we recognize the importance of developing strong mentoring relationships with faculty colleagues. We consider mentoring to be an essential component of our efforts to ensure that our faculty succeed professionally and become productive members of our academic community. Extension employees will benefit from having an experienced mentor, or team of mentors, who will devote time and effort to steward junior colleagues and make recommendations for setting priorities, developing a network of colleagues and advisors, increasing visibility, and successfully navigating both annual performance reviews and Promotion & Tenure reviews.

The Extension Scholarship Task Force strongly recommends that the FCH and 4-H Program Leaders work with each Extension faculty member to identify a suitable mentor or team of mentors. Ideally, these mentors should include experienced senior colleagues who are familiar with the program of the mentee.

Appendices

A. Excerpts from the OSU Faculty Handbook

Source: **CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#criteria>

Scholarship and Creative Activity

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

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

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

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

When work that is the product of joint effort is presented as evidence of scholarship, clarification of the candidate's role in the joint effort should be provided in the dossier. In certain positions, seeking competitive grants and contracts is an essential responsibility, and success in this endeavor—particularly when the grants are highly competitive and peer-reviewed— is a component of achievement in scholarship.

Source: **CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#criteria>

Criteria for Promotions

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

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

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

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

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

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

- distinction in teaching, advising, service, or other assigned duties, as evident in continuing development and sustained effectiveness in these areas, new and innovative teaching, curricular development, awards and recognition;
- distinction in scholarship, as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession;
- exemplary institutional and professional service and an appropriate balance between the two.

Criteria for Promotion of Clinical, Practice, Research, Fixed Term Extension and Courtesy Faculty (approved April 11, 2013 to include Professor of Practice)

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

Source: **CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#criteria>

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

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

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

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

Source: **GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION (approved by the Faculty Senate, April 11, 2013)**

<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#Practice>

V. PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE WORK

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

The appropriateness and importance of the type of scholarship will vary with the expectations of the position. The principle of peer review and recognition becomes increasingly important as the faculty member progresses through academic ranks. In the case of Professor of Practice faculty, emphasis is placed on peer recognition as a professional practitioner in community settings. Peer recognition results from scholarly accomplishments can take many forms. The order of examples is not intended to rank importance. Publication in peer-reviewed journals is the most traditional form of scholarship, but professor of practice-track publications might more commonly encompass description and evaluation of novel community-based professional practice or research application, program development and innovation, outcomes of innovative programs and/or services, definitive professional practice reviews, or case reports among others. Authorship of extension publications, local or regional "practice" publications, book chapters, videotapes, other educational materials and electronic information delivery media is considered scholarly if it is either peer reviewed before dissemination or if there is evidence of its adoption and use by peers. Invited presentations, poster and podium presentations, and published abstracts at state and national levels are other examples of scholarship, provided that evidence of peer validation is provided. Documented impact due to local or regional adoption of practices developed through research activities is considered scholarship. Advising government agencies, industry, or professional groups are all considered evidence of scholarship. Authorship of a patent in the faculty member's field is considered as evidence of creative scholarship.

Honorary degrees, awards recognizing community, professional and/or scientific achievements, and fellowship in national professional and/or scientific organizations are considered as evidence of peer recognition.

Source: **DOSSIER PREPARATION GUIDELINES 2016-2017**

<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dossier>

C. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Scholarship and creative activity are understood to be intellectual work whose significance is validated by peers and which is communicated. As specified in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, such work in its diverse forms is based on a high level of professional expertise; must give evidence of originality; must be documented and validated as through peer review or critique; and must be communicated in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself.

1. In identifying scholarly and creative activity, use appropriate headings (e.g. refereed publications, juried exhibits, non-refereed publications).

- Refereed papers or juried exhibitions or compositions should be listed separately from non-refereed papers or indicated with an asterisk.
- All authors should be given in the order they appear in the paper (not "with John Smith and Kathy Brown"). Date of publication, volume, and pages must be given. When work that is the product of joint effort is presented as evidence of scholarship, **clarification of the candidate's role in the joint effort should be provided in the dossier.**
- Where not obvious, the dossier should explain how the work was validated and communicated. It is also important to know the significance of the scholarship and creative activity and the stature of the sources in which they appear. These can be commented on after each listing, and discussed in letters of evaluation from the promotion and tenure committee, the Department Chair, Head, Director, or Dean.

2. For professional meetings, symposia, and conferences, note the dates, location, and role of the faculty member (e.g. organizer, chair, invited speaker, discussant, presenter). Where these are presented as scholarship or creative activity, explain the validation process and the significance or stature of the event.

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

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

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

B. Journals that may be good candidates for publishing Extension articles

The following list is just a sampling of journals in which Extension faculty in the College of Public Health and Human Sciences have published over the past several years. Of course, there are many other journals as well, including disciplinary journals that do not have an explicit focus on Extension programming, and regional journals that focus on the Pacific Northwest. Extension faculty seeking suggestions for appropriate journals as venues for their scholarship should consult with their mentoring team and other colleagues.

- *Journal of Extension* (www.joe.org)
- *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension* (www.jhseonline.com/)
- *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* (<http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe>)
- *Journal of Youth Development* (<https://jyd.pitt.edu/ojs/jyd>)

This report was written by an Extension Scholarship task force appointed by CPHHS Associate Dean Roberta Riportella in April 2017.

Task force members:

Marc Braverman, FCH Specialist, OSU campus (chair)

Mary Arnold, 4-H YD Specialist, OSU campus

Virginia Bourdeau 4-H YD Specialist, OSU 4-H Center

Patricia Case, FCH faculty, Klamath County

Jamie Davis, 4-H YD and FCH faculty, Lake County

Derek Godwin, Extension Watershed Management Specialist, OSU campus

Kathy Gunter, FCH Specialist, OSU campus

Karen Hooker, School Head, SOBE, CPHHS

Sunil Khanna, School Head, BPHS, CPHHS

Mike Knutz, 4-H YD faculty, Yamhill County

This report has been approved and adopted by administrators in CPHHS:

Roberta Riportella, Associate Dean and FCH Program Leader

Pamela Rose, 4-H YD Program Leader

Karen Hooker, School Head, SOBE

Sheryl Thorburn, School Head, SOBE

Sunil Khanna, School Head, BPHS

Norm Hord, School Head, BPHS

Javier Nieto, Dean, CPHHS