

## **College of Pharmacy Oregon State University Guidelines for Review of Faculty**

### **Review for Tenure and Promotion**

Following University and American Association of University Professors Guidelines, this review will take place no later than the fall of the faculty member's sixth year as an assistant professor. Earlier reviews may take place for assistant professors who have an outstanding record.

This review will follow University procedures for the preparation of dossiers and will be coordinated by the Faculty Development and Promotions Committee. It is the joint responsibility of the candidate, the committee chair, chair of the candidate's department and the dean to review the most recent university procedures for conducting this intensive review that includes formal student input and review by colleagues and outside reviewers from comparable or peer institutions. The Faculty Development and Promotions Committee and the department chair will write independent letters of evaluation based on the contents of the dossier addressed to the dean.

**Dossier preparation:** Candidates prepare dossiers according to university guidelines (<http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/dosguide.html>).

The supervisor of the tenure unit and a Faculty Development and Promotions Committee formed from among the faculty within the unit independently evaluate the materials in the candidate's dossier. The duties of each are described in the following two sections.

**Committee role:** The College Faculty Development and Promotions Committee is an independent voice of evaluation that is identified within the college whose membership is determined by a transparent process approved by the tenured and tenure-track faculty. The committee is comprised of a subset of tenured faculty and clinical-track faculty, appointed by the Dean and approved by a vote of the entire faculty. The committee has equal representation from the two departments. The composition of the committee provides representation to evaluate effectively the areas of assignments identified in the candidate's position description, area of expertise, programs of study, location, etc. The committee includes at least three voting members; ad hoc members of the committee who are external to the College are added by faculty vote when necessary. For tenured candidates being considered for promotion or untenured candidates being considered for both promotion and tenure, only tenured faculty members above the current rank of the candidate may vote. For untenured candidates being considered solely for tenure, only tenured faculty members at or above the current rank of the candidate may

vote. If there are not enough faculty of the appropriate rank within the unit, members from outside of the unit will be elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty to serve as voting members on the committee. Retired faculty (even those on 1040 assignments) are not eligible to vote at the tenure unit level. The college faculty committee review should ensure that each dossier has been carefully and properly prepared, and that uniform or equivalent standards are applied to all candidates within the college.

The letter from the College Faculty Development and Promotions Committee is added to the dossier and forwarded to the dean. The dean's letter is added to the dossier and forwarded to the University level committee. Both college level letters are provided to the candidate. The candidate will then have one week to provide any additional response directly to the University level committee.

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

**Supervisor's Role:** In addition to the information available in the candidate's dossier, the supervisor will also consult the candidate's personnel file maintained in the unit. The supervisor's letter of evaluation may include comments on any information in the candidate's file that is relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties, scholarship, collegiality, professional integrity, or willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments. If the individual serving in the unit chair/head role is on a 1040 assignment, he/she can write the supervisor's letter of evaluation.

**Peer Evaluations:** Peer review is an important and necessary mechanism to evaluate each assignment within the candidate's position description. Each unit should have procedures in place to assure a peer review process for each assignment. Faculty with teaching, extension, outreach, clinical or other assignments should have evaluations covering each peer review process. Scholarship peer evaluation is achieved through external letters using the process outlined in section IX of the dossier preparation guidelines <http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/dosguide.html>.

**Student Input:** As required by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, students will be invited to participate in the review of faculty for promotion and tenure. The purpose of the student evaluation letter is to document the student perspective of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher and advisor. In order to provide the university with a consistent source of information for the process, the unit P&T committee and the unit supervisor should endeavor to organize student committees for faculty evaluation using the process outlined in section VI of the dossier preparation guidelines <http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/dosguide.html>.

**Unit Letters of Evaluation of the Candidate:** The letters from the supervisor and the Faculty Development and Promotions Committee are to evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. If the candidate reports to, or works closely with, more than one supervisor and more than one unit, letters from each supervisor and unit P&T committee should be included. These letters should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and summarize all peer and external solicited evaluations. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters.

**Report to the Candidate:** The unit supervisor is required to meet with the candidate to share the outcomes of the unit reviews prior to the dossier being forwarded to the next level for review. The candidate has one week after receiving all unit reviews to add a written statement regarding these reviews, to be included in the dossier. In addition, at any time during the review process the candidate may withdraw his or her dossier. If both the supervisor's and the committee's recommendations are negative, the dossier will not be forwarded to the next level of review, unless the candidate, following discussion with the supervisor, insists, or the candidate is in the final year of annual tenure. In such cases the dossier must be forwarded for consideration, unless the candidate submits a letter of resignation.