

**Five-Year Annual Review  
Promotion and Tenure Committee**

Faculty Senate Committee on Committees  
March 14, 2003

This review of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is submitted in accordance with the duties of the Committee on Committees to review each Faculty Senate Committee at five-year intervals, using the following five criteria established by the Faculty Senate:

1. Do the Standing Rules clearly reflect the function and composition of this council?
2. Have the Committee's actions/functions, as reported in the annual reports and by consulting with the current Chair and Committee, been consistent with their Standing Rules?
3. Do the annual reports provide a memory of the issues this Committee addressed, their activities, and any outcomes?
4. What has been the role/benefit of student members?
5. What connection is there to the University's strategic goals?

The Committee on Committees reports that:

1. The Standing Rules for the Promotion and Tenure Committee, were last updated in March, 2002. Changes made at that time were the result of a comprehensive review of the Standing Rules by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The revised wording more clearly states the actual function and activities of the committee. The changes were made, in part, to clear up perceived confusion between the role of the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The composition of the committee is generally in accordance with the Standing Rules, however, a large number of retirements from the University in January, 2003 have left the committee one member short at the time of this report (March, 2003).
2. The Promotion and Tenure Committee actions, as reported in the available annual reports from 1996-97, 1997-98, 1999-2000, and 2001-2002, are consistent with the Standing Rules. Reports for 1998-1999 and 2000-2001 were not found at the Faculty Senate web site. Dan Arp, the current chair of the committee was only recently appointed (6 weeks ago) as chair to fill in for a retirement and he suggested that Rakesh Gupta, the previous chair, be contacted regarding the committee's actions. Dr. Gupta indicated that the committee did very closely review the standing rules as well as the charges given the committee by the Faculty Senate President. The result, as outlined in the 2001-2002 Annual Report, is that a number of policies were discussed and recommendations written, including those addressing position descriptions, early tenure, external reviewer letters, post-tenure review, and tenure requirement for instructors. Some of these recommendations have been adopted and others have not. In order to clarify University policies, the committee also put together a flow chart that provides an overview of the P & T process at OSU. This flow chart is listed as Appendix J in the Annual Report.
3. The annual reports of the Promotion and Tenure Committee vary in detail, but are generally well-written and very descriptive of the activities of the committee. They provide a record of issues that were addressed that are sometimes controversial and include recommendations and suggestions for items for future discussion. The most recent annual report (2001-2002) includes 10 appendices that are very helpful in stating recommendations, revisions, and documenting pertinent meetings of the committee.
4. There are no students on the Promotion and Tenure committee. Given the charge and standing rules for this committee, student membership would not be appropriate.
5. The Promotion and Tenure Committee is an integral part of achieving the University's strategic goals: To create a compelling learning experience for our students, staff and faculty; to be recognized as a top-tier university on all scales of measurement; and to treat the State of Oregon

as the campus of Oregon State University. The committee is not only responsible for oversight of the process that results in granting tenure and promotion to those faculty with proven accomplishments and skills, but it provides leadership for programs that facilitate, improve, and delineate the process.