

## Promotion & Tenure Committee

February 3, 2017

Minutes

*Voting members present:* Gary Delander, Theo Dreher, Janet Lee, Mei-Ching Lien, Deb Pence

*Voting members absent:* Eric Kirby

### **One vs. Two Separate Waiver Forms for External Reviewer Letters and Student Letters**

The Promotion & Tenure Committee's suggestions from the previous meeting on December 2, 2016: "The first possible change would be to alter the waiver to include only external review letters and to ensure that all student letters were held in confidence, regardless of whether or not a waiver was signed. The second possible change to the current policy would be to allow for two separate waivers: one for the external reviewers and one for the student reviewers. The problem of an unbiased student review, however, still exists if the candidate chooses not to sign either waiver."

*Rebecca Gose, University legal counsel, provided clarification between meetings:* "There is an Oregon statute that gives all faculty members the right to have access to records that are about them. See ORS 352.226(3), (13). This statute also prohibits universities from evaluating faculty members on the basis of anonymous information. See ORS 352.226(10). So, we would need a waiver on both fronts, from student and external reviewers, or else faculty members get to see who wrote what (and if we don't know who wrote what, we cannot use it in evaluation). If you want to do the waivers separately for students and external reviewers, that would be just fine."

[https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills\\_laws/ors/ors352.html](https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors352.html)

#### *Action items:*

- *Based on this clarification, the committee recommends two separate waivers be utilized, one for external review letters and one for student letters.*
- *The committee chair will prepare a short statement of rationale and forward this recommendation to the Faculty Senate Executive committee.*

### **Updates on P&T Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Instructors**

Committee members developed language for an updated guideline for promotion of non-tenure instructors. A draft document was provided for consideration.

There was some discussion related to specific wording for the number of letters to be solicited and received. The recommendation was that 'at least four' letters be included; 'at least two letters' from 'a list of four evaluators' provided by the candidate and 'an equal number' of letters from a list generated by the unit leader, dean or unit P&T committee.

Additional discussion explored whether further clarification of who would be an appropriate evaluator, beyond that detailed in section 'g' was necessary. The committee determined that section 'g' was adequate.

*Action: The committee approved a final draft document (Appendix A below) and asked that the committee chair deliver the document to the Faculty Senate Executive committee for consideration.*

### **Faculty Request for Dossier Review**

A request was made at the last committee meeting for a member of the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee to participate in a review of the dossier for a candidate being considered for tenure and/or promotion this year to ensure that the process and documentation to date is consistent with guidelines. The results of the review will be included as an additional letter in the dossier.

The committee heard and discussed a report of the review. There was consensus on the committee that the opportunity for faculty to request a review is important and valuable. The committee asked that the chair investigate how this is noted in Promotion and Tenure guidelines, to assure that this opportunity for additional review is obvious to faculty being considered for promotion and tenure.

### **Future Meetings**

A meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 3 (11 AM in Reed Lodge), pending receipt of business items.

The chair was asked to explore the possibility of a committee meeting with the new Provost in March or early April.

### **Adjourned**

*Minutes prepared by Gary DeLander*

## Appendix A

### Simplified Review Processes for Non-tenure track Instructors (FS P&T final draft 02-01-2017)

#### GUIDELINES FOR NON-TENURE TRACK PROMOTION

- i. Goal - to ensure that promotion is not simply awarded for time in service but that the individual meets the criteria specified for promotion and that there is consistency in instructor performance expectations at the college and university levels
- ii. Criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor I
  - a. four years of full-time service, calculated from the hire date to December 31 of the calendar year prior to the promotion decision;
  - b. have a graduate degree appropriate to the assigned duties, or comparable educational or professional experience;
  - c. have special skills or experience needed in the unit;
  - d. have an exceptional record of achievement in the assigned duties.
- iii. Criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor II
  - a. 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;
  - b. a candidate must have a sustained record of exceptional achievement and evidence of professional growth and innovation in assigned duties.
- iv. Dossier expectations specific to instructors
  - a. candidate statement
  - b. chronological log of courses including
    1. course number and title
    2. number of students in each class
    3. personal SET scores with comparison to parallel unit and college scores
  - c. teaching portfolio - for one of the individual's representative courses that has been taught over a period of years, create a teaching portfolio that includes at least the following
    1. syllabus
    2. outline of learning objectives
    3. evidence of full-cycle assessment
    4. examples of in-class materials
    5. examples of exams, projects, rubrics, and other grading tools
    6. other "artifacts" that document class success in meeting learning objectives
  - d. letter from peer teaching committee
    1. includes documentation of on-going assessments routinely conducted in candidate's unit
    2. includes assessment of class portfolio
  - e. letter from student teaching review committee established and operated as outlined for other faculty. Students will also review the course teaching portfolio
  - f. list outcomes of expected research, outreach, and other unique activities as specified in position description; list scholarship; service, and awards
  - g. at least four letters of evaluation from any of the following categories
    1. Senior I or Senior II instructors in other units in the OSU system
    2. instructors at other universities or institutions around the nation who are doing similar work and hold a senior rank to the candidate

3. OSU professorial-ranked faculty who can provide a knowledgeable assessment of the candidate's work as the faculty member has worked with instructors doing similar types of teaching
- h. candidate submits a list of four evaluators who meet the criteria stated above and from this list, at least -two letters will be obtained for the final dossier. If additional names are needed, these will be obtained from the candidate by the unit leader. Letters from at least two other evaluators are to be obtained from a list generated by the unit leader, dean, or unit P&T committee in accordance with practices determined within the unit. There will be an equal number of reviewers from the candidate's list and from the list generated by the unit leader, dean or unit P&T committee. All letters must be requested by the unit leader, dean, or the unit's promotion and tenure committee chair, not the candidate. A brief statement must be included as to why each reviewer was chosen, i.e., what were they expected to add to the review.
- v. Expedited process
    - a. Assessments are conducted by the unit committee, unit leader, college committee, and college dean. The goal of these assessments is to assure that the candidate has met stated criteria for the promotion. Reviews at the college level should also assure consistency in treatment of candidates across units in the college.
    - b. If all unit and college letters are in agreement on promotion, then the dean's decision is final and forwarded to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Provost.
    - c. If any one of the unit or college letters is negative, even if the dean's letter is positive, then the package is sent on to the university level for assessment. This is to assure that upper level administration is aware of any issues surrounding the promotion.
    - d. Faculty not approved for promotion by the Provost and Executive Vice President may appeal to the President within two weeks of receipt of the letter announcing the decision. When appealing, the candidate must write a letter to the President stating the grounds for the appeal and facts that support it. No other supporting letters will be considered. The President has the right to request additional information.