

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 2001-2002

Promotion & Tenure Committee

Annual Report 2001-2002

Members of the 2001-2002 Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee were:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Rakesh Gupta, Chair Wood Science and Engineering | College of Forestry (2002) |
| 2. Shawna Grosskopf, Economics | College of Science (2002) |
| 3. Mary Powelson, Botany and Plant Pathology | College of Agriculture (2003) |
| 4. Jack Higginbotham, Nuclear Engineering | College of Engineering (2003) |
| 5. Charles Langford, Sociology | College of Liberal Arts (2004) |
| 6. Vacant (2004) | |

The Faculty Senate (FS) Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee reviews University P&T Guidelines and advises on matters pertaining to the P&T process. The Committee reads the dossiers and observes the annual P&T process conducted by the University P&T Committee to ensure an equitable process for all faculty. When the University P&T Committee does not reach a consensus on the recommendation, or when circumstances warrant discussion of a particular case, the candidate's Dean (sometimes Unit Head or immediate Supervisor) meets with the University P&T Committee. In these instances, one member of the FS P&T Committee is present as an observer to represent the Faculty Senate. The observer notes adherence to the University P&T Guidelines and the nature of the decision-making process, but does not evaluate the merits of the particular case.

The Committee provides input on the P&T decision process through its annual report to the FS Executive Committee (EC) and to the Provost's office. The annual report also includes a summary of the current year's P&T actions provided by the Office of the Provost.

The Committee consists of six faculty members who have been granted tenure at OSU, who reflect the diversity of the University. Whenever a committee member is under consideration for promotion, he or she will be ineligible to serve on the Committee during the year in which the review is scheduled.

The Committee also provides leadership for campus-wide educational programs related to the P&T process and facilitates ongoing dialogue about these matters. Members of the Committee are available to respond to procedural and interpretative questions from faculty, unit heads/chairs, deans, and department and college committees.

1. Review of the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The following items (based on 2000-2001 Annual Report of the FS P&T Committee) were given to the Committee by the Faculty Senate President to be reviewed and discussed by the Committee, and provide recommendations:

1. Standing Rules

Charge - Review standing rules and propose changes if necessary

Response - The Committee revised the standing rule to make its language more consistent across various P&T related documents, and with the actual work of the Committee. The old and the revised standing rules are given in Appendix A.

2. Position Description

Charge - Revise text regarding 'Position Descriptions' found in the 'Dossier Preparation Guidelines'

Response - The 'Position Description' section of the 'Dossier Preparation Guidelines' was revised to reflect the recommendations of the previous year's committee. The main recommendation was to include multiple dated Position Descriptions (one signed and dated for each year or signed and dated each year on the same one) on the departmental/unit letter head indicating changes or no changes in assigned duties. The old and revised position description sections are given in Appendix B.

Based on our discussions and a forum (see section III.3), there are still some unanswered questions about position description: (i) who initiates it? (ii) who has the final authority to approve/enforce it? (iii) is it confidential?

3. Distinction

Charge - Attempt needs to be made to arrive at an operational definition for 'Distinction' for individuals seeking promotion to full professor.

Response - The Committee believes that there are different ways in which the distinction can be achieved in various disciplines. Therefore, it was not possible to arrive at one common definition of distinction which will work for all faculty members in all units at OSU. The Committee believes that it should be left up to the individual faculty member to demonstrate that s/he has achieved distinction in assigned duties as outlined in his/her position description. We recommend (see Appendix C) revising the 'Criteria for Promotion to Professor' section of 'Promotion and Tenure Guideline' document to reflect it more explicitly.

The Committee also believes that the distinction should not be based on: (a) ability to raise money and (b) quantity of work.

4. Early Tenure

Charge - (a) Explicit policy needed regarding individuals seeking early tenure - unclear whether such individuals will be evaluated against higher standards or the same standards as those pursuing tenure after six years; discuss with committee and Sabah Randhawa, and (b) Explicit policy needed that defines what 'going up early' means in relation to time in rank as Associate Professor before consideration for promotion to full professor; discuss with committee and Sabah Randhawa.

Response - The Committee met with Sabah Randhawa to discuss both issues and a policy regarding 'early tenure' was drafted. Our goal was to allow faculty members to seek 'early tenure' but still restrict the number of times a faculty member can apply for early tenure. A proposed draft of the policy is shown in Appendix D.

At a meeting called by the Provost (see Section IV), the Provost pointed out that in the past few years there were too many cases of early tenure and he is looking into ways of reducing it. He also suggested a possible solution that candidates can come up early for tenure, but they are out if unsuccessful! The Committee briefly discussed this issue (because it was brought up too late in the year) and felt that 'one strike and you are out' policy is too harsh. Instead the Committee is suggesting a twofold approach:

1. A candidate cannot initiate early tenure unless invited to do so by the department/unit head/chair (also shown in Appendix D), and
2. revised language in the University P&T Guidelines. The Guidelines state 'Tenure is granted for achievement, not for years in rank,

'Tenure is granted for achievement. Under normal circumstances.....' The committee believes that by making these two changes the early tenure cases may be reduced but still allow exceptional cases to go through, and will help in attracting outstanding and promising young faculty.

5. University P&T Process

Charge - Discuss whether a FS P&T Committee member should be involved in the selection of which dossiers are going to be given further review. Regardless of involvement, P&T Committee should be informed of the process being used to determine selection.

Response - The Committee voted against getting involved in selection of dossiers which are going to be given further review because the Committee observes the review of these dossiers while they are being discussed by the University P&T Committee to ensure an equitable process for all faculty and adherence to the University P&T Guidelines.

The Committee received the University P&T Committee's process of reviewing dossiers in early March from Sabah Randhawa (shown in Appendix E). According to this document (and clarification from Sabah Randhawa), the University P&T Committee doesn't discuss the case if it was 'negative' at unit/department and college levels and the University P&T Committee agrees with their decision. For such cases, in the past (including current year), the FS P&T Committee never got to review the dossiers and was never a part of any discussion. As a matter of fact, these are probably the most important cases which should be observed by the Committee for adherence to University P&T Guidelines. It is recommended that, in future, the Committee is invited to review all such dossiers and should be a part of the discussion where such cases are discussed.

6. Balance between Teaching and Scholarship across Colleges

Charge - Is more consistency needed across colleges regarding the balance between teaching and scholarship, and how would this be monitored?

No Discussion

7. External Reviewers

Charge - (i) Since some departments/units pay external reviewers for dossier evaluation and some don't, a University policy must be developed regarding how reference letters are obtained. (Nancy Rosenberger will check with Sabah Randhawa whether the University will handle this issue.); (ii) Since it's unclear how letters are chosen for inclusion in the dossier, an explicit policy is needed so the candidate's dossier is constructed in the fairest manner possible. Committee will discuss and possibly make recommendation that no more than eight letters may be solicited; letters must be chosen from the eight solicited or more solicited when those are not received.

Response - The Committee discussed the issue of external letters of evaluation at length. As far as issue of payment to external reviewers is concerned, we checked with Sara Eklund and Gigi Bruce and they told us that they are not aware of any unit on campus who pays for the external letters of evaluation. Should we pay for external letters of evaluation? The Committee did not discuss this issue but it was brought up at the Provost's Council meeting (Chair was invited to attend while Sabah Randhawa was presenting 'lessons learnt from this year's P&T process' to the Council). But, because of the current budget crunch, the question was raised - who will pay for this? - unit, college, university? There was no further discussion on this topic.

The Committee addressed the following issues which have been raised at various FS and University P&T Committee meetings: (i) letters are not very helpful because frequently they are letters of advocacy and not evaluation, (ii) difficult to get the required number of letters, (iii) how many letters should be from the list submitted by the candidate, (iv) how many from the unit head or departmental committee's list, (v) how to choose where to get letters, (vi) which letters to include, etc.

After a lengthy discussion, a new policy on 'External Letters of Evaluation' was drafted and it is included in Appendix F. We are recommending that 'a relevant portion of the University P&T Guidelines' be sent with solicitation letter and putting more emphasis on 'evaluation'. We are also

recommending that letters be sought from 'peer institutions' in order for them to evaluate the candidate fairly. The Committee believes that instead of requiring a minimum and maximum number of letters, which is sometimes difficult to achieve, as long as at least 50% of the letters are requested from a list provided by the candidate any number of letters would be okay. This is reflected in the proposed policy. We feel that this will take care of all the issues listed above.

8. Release of Results

Charge - Address the issue of the Provost not releasing results for an entire college until all decisions are made

Response - The Committee briefly discussed this issue and suggests that all the results (university wide) be released at the same time.

9. Post-Tenure Review

Charge - Continue review of post-tenure review guidelines across campus and report results to the FS EC

Response - The Committee did not review the post-tenure guidelines because the Office of the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs was in the process of finalizing the guidelines. The chair of the Committee was invited to attend one meeting where the guidelines were discussed. The guidelines were finalized by the vice-provost, Sabah Randhawa, and implemented in November 2001. The final guidelines are given in Appendix G.

The Committee raised an issue about item 3 of the process. The item three states that 'A unit review committee of faculty peers, appointed by the unit/department head/chair, will review the dossier.' The Committee made the recommendation that the unit/department review committee of faculty peers be 'elected' by the faculty peers and not 'appointed' by the unit head in order to keep the process 'open and democratic'. The Committee's recommendation was not accepted.

10. Tenure of Instructors

Charge - Address the following issues: For promotion from instructor to senior instructor; is scholarship, teaching or both required?

Response - The Committee did not discuss these issues because there was a task force on 'Tenure/Hiring Practices for Instructors' which discussed these issues. The task force was chaired by Roy Arnold; other members were Nancy Rosenberger, Angelo Gomez, Mary Powelson, Mike Oriard, and Kevin Ahern. The issue is twofold: (1) Instructors' job descriptions typically have no scholarship component. So we run into problems when a request is made to tenure Senior Instructors because their job descriptions have no scholarship component and scholarship is required for promotion. (2) A major change in job description, as for example, from untenured to tenured, requires that we follow Affirmative Action (AA) hiring practices and, at the very minimum, units obtain waiver of search from AA. This is typically not followed when Senior Instructors are tenured.

The recommendations of the task force are give in Appendix H but they have not been finalized yet. (The recommendations have been shared with the deans and with the FS EC. The deans as well as the EC agree with these except bullet #3 which pertains to tenure; both the EC and the deans disagree with this recommendation. The recommendation is not consistent with the current P&T guidelines.)

2. **Observations based on University P&T Committee deliberations**

In 2001-2002, consensus was achieved by the University P&T Committee for all cases except twenty-five (25) dossiers. The FS P&T Committee reviewed these dossiers. The University P&T Committee discussed these dossiers with respective deans and a member of the FS P&T Committee was present at all meetings. The Committee submits the following remarks and recommendations, based on our reading of the discussed dossiers and observations during the University P&T Committee meetings:

- The Committee believes that the P&T process (especially at the unit and college level) should be 'open (transparent) and democratic'. P&T Committees at the various levels should be elected and not selected to keep the process 'open and democratic'. However, the Committee also realized that units should have the freedom to choose how they want to conduct the process and how they want to choose various committees. But no matter how the committees are chosen and no matter what the process is, the P&T process at the unit level should be in writing, shared with the candidate at the time of hiring and filed with the provost's office/FS office in order for all the involved parties to be aware of the process.
- Colleges have different ways of evaluating P&T dossiers. Some have college wide P&T committees consisting of faculty members from various units within the college. Some colleges have committees consisting of various deans and/or unit heads. The committee believes that each college should have a college wide P&T Committee composed of peers (faculty members) from the various units (independent of deans) of the college in order to have an independent assessment of the dossiers beyond the unit to assure consistency across units in a college. However, the Committee again realizes that colleges should have freedom to choose how they want to conduct the process. Regardless of what the process is, the P&T process at the college level should be in writing, shared with the candidate at the time of hiring and filed with the provost's office/FS office in order for all the involved parties to be aware of the process.
- It is recommended that Tenure Time line should be established for each candidate at the time of hire, possibly centrally at the provost's office and the candidate is requested (possibly by the provost or unit head?) to submit his/her dossier in order to ensure candidate applies for tenure when s/he is due. In the current year, one candidate applied for promotion and tenure in the seventh year because the date of hire was entered incorrectly. Creating a tenure time line for each candidate and requesting them to apply for promotion and tenure when they are due may avoid such problems in the future.
- Promotion and Tenure should be based on quality scholarship, quality teaching and quality service. Candidates should not be denied tenure and/or promotion only because they have not added to the department's fame. Likewise, a person should not be denied promotion or tenure because they have not raised sufficient money when the three main aspects of their performance (scholarship, teaching and service) represent quality results. The ability to raise money or to increase department's fame is not the same as creating or teaching knowledge. Thus, fund-raising and effective publicity should not be used as an index for either quality research or instruction.
- The P&T dossiers currently show what candidates have done over 5-6 years but do not show progress or mentoring received over the years. During our observation of the P&T cases, we came across a case where no annual review was done for the candidate over 5-6 years. This candidate never got any feedback regarding progress toward P&T. This created split voting for P&T based on what the candidate was doing and what the candidate should have done. The Committee recommends that the annual reviews, which are conducted at the unit level every year, be a part of the P&T dossiers in order for everyone to be aware of the progress the candidate is making and the kind of mentoring the candidate is receiving. In order to keep the size of the dossiers manageable, it is recommended that one page summary of annual review should be included with the P&T dossier.
- The meaning of 'Distinction' continues to be a problem for candidates seeking promotion to full professor. Even though the Committee made recommendations (see I.3 above and Appendix C) it will continue to be a 'sticky' point in the evaluation of dossiers considered for the promotion to full professor. It is even a bigger problem for extension and library dossiers. Also it is not clear from the current guidelines if the candidates have to achieve distinction in all three areas.

The committee believes that awarding of large grants/contracts was often tied to 'distinction'. This should not be, because there are various fields where 'distinction' can be achieved without acquiring large grants/contract.

- Extension and Library dossiers continue to be 'problematic' in terms of how to evaluate scholarship. It seems that there is a need to come up with a way to define and evaluate scholarship for extension and library faculty members. It is also possible to look into devising a separate P&T process for the extension and library faculty members where scholarship is defined and evaluated differently.

- External letters of evaluation are an important part of the dossiers. Therefore, it should be identified how they were chosen/selected because they are more often letters of advocacy. Evaluations from these letters should be based on universalistic and not particularistic criteria.
- Position Descriptions have improved over the years but still don't provide clear expectations. Scholarship expectations should be consistent with OSU's P&T guidelines. How teaching and service will be evaluated should be clear to the candidate at the time of hiring.
- The current University P&T Guidelines have been in effect since 1995. The Committee recommends that its effectiveness be assessed. The review should include: (i) a summary of P&T cases for the last 7 years, (ii) number of cases that came up early (by year, i.e., 1 year early, 2 years early, etc.) and their success rate, (iii) review of extension and library cases, (iv) number of dossiers forwarded each year to the university P&T committee and how many resulted in appeal/grievances and did appeal/grievances decrease over time?, (v) review of women/minority cases. Since it is going to be a major task to review the effectiveness of the current P&T guidelines, it is recommended that a university level task force be appointed by the Provost. The task force should include one or two members of the original task force, one member from the FS P&T Committee, one member from the University P&T Committee and faculty members from across university.
- Even though we believe that the P&T process, in general, is fair and just for all faculty members, we need to make sure that there are no biases toward women and faculty of color. In particular, decision makers should be aware of the different working styles of men and women and the added service component (committees, guest speaking, etc.) put on minorities.
- The Committee should continue to sponsor campus-wide brown bag lunches, especially for the new faculty members, unit heads and deans, that focus on all aspects of the P&T process at OSU. In an effort to provide an overview of the P&T process at OSU the Committee developed a flowchart (Appendix J) which was distributed at the brown bag lunches. The flowchart should be updated and revised annually and distributed to the faculty members at the brown bag lunches and other P&T related seminars.
- The Committee recommends that the P&T FAQ should be annually updated using the annual reports of the FS P&T Committee.
- Each year, the FS P&T Committee's membership should be updated on the university web page.
- The University P&T Committee discussed all cases openly and fairly by adhering to the University P&T Guidelines. Our Committee believes that the University P&T Committee tried to collect all evidence and tried to make an informed decision on each case. As a matter of fact, the University P&T Committee leaned in the direction of giving all candidates every benefit of doubt in their decisions. The University P&T Committee was fair in their deliberations while also trying to maintain quality at OSU.

3. Campus-wide educational programs

The Committee and/or Chair were involved in the following educational programs:

- September 21, 2001 - 'Overview of Promotion and Tenure Process at OSU' by Rakesh Gupta and Sabah Randhwa; New Faculty Orientation, LsSells Stewart Center.
- October 16, 2001 - Brown Bag Lunch, Rakesh Gupta and Sabah Randhawa, MU (attendance 35+).
- January 23, 2002 - 'Faculty Position Descriptions' by Rakesh Gupta; Forums on Faculty Rewards and Evaluation - Faculty Position Descriptions.
- May 14, 2001 - Brown Bag Lunch, Rakesh Gupta and Sabah Randhawa, MU (attendance 30+). In conjunction with 'Critical Issues Project' - Definition and Assessment of Scholarship.

4. Other Committee Activities

The Committee was invited to attend an one-time meeting (June 3, 2002) called by the Provost to

discuss observations about the P&T process at OSU and highlight problem areas. The meeting was also attended by the FS EC, OSU-2007 committee on teaching/advising, Sabah Randhawa, and Vickie Nunnemaker. Various issues were surfaced by those who attended the meeting. Vickie took detailed notes and has summarized the discussion. It is included in Appendix I. The FS P&T Committee did not have time to discuss all these items and recommends that these items be discussed in future years.

5. Tasks for next year

In addition to the items listed in sections I, II and IV above, the Committee should also address the following issues raised by the OSU-2007 satellite team that is looking into "How well do current OSU policies and procedures (especially promotion and tenure guidelines) serve the teaching/advising mission of the university?" (Note that Question 1 focuses on guidelines AS WRITTEN and that Question 2 focuses on guidelines AS INTERPRETED). Specifically,

1. Do you think that OSU's current P&T guidelines at OSU give the flexibility needed to promote and tenure faculty members who are good teachers and advisors?
2. Do you think that OSU's current P&T guidelines are interpreted and applied in ways that promote good teaching and advising at OSU?
3. Can you suggest new policies and procedures that might FOSTER good teaching and advising at OSU? (One way that's been discussed is to hire, support, and reward faculty whose primarily interests and skills are in teaching and advising)

6. Summary of 2001-2002 P&T actions

A summary of the disposition of all these cases was prepared by Sabah Randhawa, vice-provost of academic affairs, and is given in Appendix K.

Appendix A - Standing Rules

OLD

Faculty Senate at Oregon State University Promotion and Tenure Committee

Standing Rules

The Promotion and Tenure Committee studies statements of policy and advises on matters pertaining to the promotion and tenure process. The Committee observes the annual promotion and tenure process in the Executive Office and reads the dossiers and provides input on the promotion and tenure decision process through its recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to the Provost's Office. The Committee shall file an annual report with the Faculty Senate that includes a summary of the previous year's promotion and tenure actions. The Committee shall consist of six faculty who have been granted tenure at OSU, whose appointments are primarily in teaching, research and extended education who reflect the diversity of the University. Whenever a committee member is under consideration for promotion, he or she will be ineligible to serve on the committee during the year in which the review is scheduled.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee provides leadership for campus-wide educational programs related to the promotion and tenure process and facilitates on-going dialogue about these matters. Members of the committee are available to respond to procedural and interpretative questions from faculty, department heads, deans, and department and college committees.

(6/99)

REVISED

Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee

Oregon State University

Standing Rules

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and advises on matters pertaining to the promotion and tenure process. The Committee reads the dossiers and observes the annual promotion and tenure process conducted by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Committee provides input on the promotion and tenure decision process through its annual report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to the Provost's office. The annual report also includes a summary of the current year's promotion and tenure actions provided by the Office of the Provost. The Committee shall consist of six faculty members who have been granted tenure at OSU, who reflect the diversity of the University. Whenever a committee member is under consideration for promotion, he or she will be ineligible to serve on the committee during the year in which the review is scheduled. The Committee provides leadership for campus-wide educational programs related to the promotion and tenure process and facilitates on-going dialogue about these matters. Members of the Committee are available to respond to procedural and interpretative questions from faculty, unit heads/chairs, deans, and department and college committees.

(6/2002)

Appendix B - Position Description

OLD

Position Description

A copy of the candidate's current position description must be included. If significant shifts in assignment have occurred, earlier position descriptions should be included. With significant assignment changes, include a table that summarizes FTE distribution among primary activities over time. Within each position description, identify expectations and the approximate percentage of responsibility associated with these three areas: teaching, advising, and other assigned duties; scholarship and creative activity; and service.

REVISED

Position Description as Recommended by the FS P&T Committee

A copy of the faculty member's annual position description for each year must be included. The description should be typed on official letterhead and be signed by the faculty member and appropriate supervisor at the time of hiring and annually thereafter. Consequently, the dossier will include multiple dated position descriptions, regardless of whether significant changes in responsibilities have occurred. Each position description must identify expectations and the approximate percentage of responsibility associated with the following three areas: teaching, advising, and other assigned duties; scholarship and creative activity; and service.

(6/2002)

Appendix C - Distinction

OLD

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

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

- distinction in teaching, advising, or other assigned duties, as evident in continuing development and sustained effectiveness in these areas;

distinction in scholarship, as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession;

- exemplary institutional, public, and/or professional service.

REVISED

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

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

- distinction in teaching, advising, or other assigned duties, as evident in continuing development and sustained effectiveness in these areas;
- distinction in scholarship, as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession;
- exemplary institutional, public, and/or professional service.

The candidate (or unit head) seeking promotion must provide evidence of having met the above criteria.

(6/2002)

Appendix D - Early Tenure

EARLY TENURE

What is 'seeking early tenure'?

Faculty member seeking tenure before five years of service in rank as full-time, tenure track faculty at Oregon State University.

Can an individual apply for early tenure?

Faculty member can apply for early tenure if (a) there is a formal written agreement for early consideration of tenure when hired, and/or (b) the criteria for granting indefinite tenure as outlined in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines have been met.

Evaluated against higher standards or the same standards as those pursuing tenure in their sixth year of service?

Faculty member going up early for tenure would be evaluated against the same standards of documented excellence as those pursuing tenure in the sixth year of service in rank.

How many times can one apply for early tenure?

A faculty member can not initiate early tenure process unless invited by the unit Head (in cooperation with the Dean).

EARLY PROMOTION (For all ranks)

The committee felt that there shouldn't be any time limit for promotion because as long as the faculty member is able to meet and demonstrate the criteria for promotion, s/he should be allowed to seek promotion anytime.

(6/2002)

Appendix E - University Promotion and Tenure Committee's Process of Reviewing Dossiers

University- Level P&T Evaluation Process - by Sabah Randhawa

1. Completed dossiers are turned into the office of Vice Provost of Academic Affairs (VPAA) by March 1, 2002 (for 2001-2 evaluations).
2. Sara Eklund, Executive Assistant to the VPAA, reviews all dossiers for:
 - Completeness
 - Adherence to P&T Guidelines
 - Duplication of Information (for faculty with appointments in multiple colleges)
 - Sara creates a database of the candidates to be evaluated
3. Sabah Randhawa, VPAA, reviews dossiers for:
 - Adherence to P&T Guidelines, particularly with respect to internal and external evaluations
 - Overall assessment of all cases to identify dossier with negative recommendations or with split recommendations
 - Detailed assessments and evaluations of all cases for promotion of FRA's to SFRA's
4. After consultation with the University P&T Committee, VPAA assigns, for each dossier, a primary evaluation and a secondary evaluator. Assignments are typically made by college, recognizing potential conflict of interest of committee members and an effort is made to balance workload of committee members.
5. A one to one and a half day is set aside for the University P&T Committee to meet and discuss all dossiers. Special focus is on dossiers with negative or split recommendations, and on ensuring consistency of evaluation within colleges and across colleges (recognizing differences in mission and goals of colleges and their impact on P&T requirements). Typically, dossiers with split recommendations or those with which the committee has concerns on questions (particularly dossier with negative recommendations) are set aside for further discussions with the college deans. Other administrators may be invited, if appropriate. Representatives from the Faculty Senate P&T Committee are invited to deliberation's involving this subset of dossiers. The University P&T Committee meets around the third week of April.
6. Individual sessions are set up between April 25 and May 10 involving the University P&T Committee, college deans and other administrators (if appropriate) and representatives from the faculty Senate P&T Committee. The Faculty Senate P&T Committee is provided an opportunity to review these cases in question prior to these meetings. Differences of perspectives, in the dossier and University P&T Committee concerns and questions are discussed at these sessions.
7. The University P&T Committee forwards its recommendations to the Provost after the meetings are completed. The Provost makes his decisions and forwards these to the College deans by May 15th.

Appendix F - External Letters of Evaluation

OLD (as given in the Promotion and Tenure Dossiers Guidelines 2000-2001)

External Letters of Evaluation

Solicited Letters of Evaluation from Outside Leaders in the Field (5 minimum, 8 maximum) Letters should generally be from leaders in the candidate's field, chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's scholarly

work. Only in rare cases should letters be solicited from co-authors, co-principal investigators, former professors, or former students. Letters should generally be from tenured professors or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field.

As described in Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (July, 1995), the candidate may submit a list of individuals meeting these criteria and, from this list, at least three will be selected by the department chair or head (or chair of the unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee). The other reviewers are to be selected by the chair, head, dean, or faculty committee according to practices determined within the unit. All letters must be requested by the department chair, head, dean, or the unit's promotion and tenure committee chair, not the candidate.

A representative form letter is attached, but any reasonable variation is acceptable. Include a copy of the actual letter used. Each reviewer should be sent a copy of the candidate's position description, personal statement, and current vita. Copies of publications are not usually sent to reviewers, but may be sent at the discretion of the individual soliciting the letter. Provide a log of contacts with the reviewers, including letters and telephone calls. Letters from external reviewers should be available prior to initiating the review of the dossier.

REVISED

External Letters of Evaluation

External letters of evaluation should be solicited from experts in the candidate's field, chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's scholarly work. Only in rare cases should letters be solicited from co-authors, co-principal investigators, former professors, or former students. Letters should be from tenured professors at peer institutions or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. The candidate must submit a list of individuals meeting these criteria. At least 50% of the external letters of evaluation must be solicited from this list (the remaining letters from unit chair, unit P&T committee, or dean's list). The unit chair/head, dean, or the unit's promotion and tenure committee chair, not the candidate, must request all letters. Both lists of names along with all the letters received must be included in the faculty member's dossier. A copy of the solicitation letter used must be included. Each evaluator should be sent a copy of the candidate's position description, personal statement, current vita, and the relevant portions of the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Copies of publications may be sent at the discretion of the individual soliciting the letter or at the request of the evaluators. A log of all contacts with the evaluators must be provided. Letters from external evaluators should be available prior to initiating the review of the dossier.

(06/2002)

Appendix G - Post-Tenure Review

Post-Tenure Review Implementation Guidelines

The University established a post-tenure review system to "*recognize and foster excellence, to help good faculty become better, and to identify and help underachieving faculty fulfill the potential that was recognized upon hiring and reaffirmed on the awarding of tenure.*" The process is intended to provide effective evaluation, useful feedback, appropriate intervention and timely assistance to ensure that every faculty member establishes and maintains an acceptable record of professional development and accomplishment during the various phases of his or her career.

The post-tenure review is normally a unit-level process that occurs every five years for each tenured faculty member. However, in the case of tenured associate professors, a college-level interim review or a formal evaluation for promotion may be substituted for the normal post-tenure review if conducted within the five-year span. The department or unit head, or the faculty member may also request a peer committee post-tenure evaluation at any time if it is considered to be beneficial to the professional development of the faculty member.

Process

The review will consist of the following steps:

1. The unit head is responsible for developing and maintaining a multi-year plan for post-tenure review to maximize effective use of faculty and staff resources. The unit head will discuss the post-tenure review process with each eligible faculty member during the winter or spring of the academic year prior to a planned review.
2. The faculty member will prepare a dossier in accordance with the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, with the exception that outside review letters will not be required, and will not ordinarily be requested. If a faculty member or unit head requests outside review, up to five reviewers will be selected, following the process used in promotion and tenure procedures.
3. A unit review committee of faculty peers, appointed by the unit head, will review the dossier. The peer committee also may include faculty outside the unit; this option might be especially appropriate for faculty whose work has a significant interdisciplinary component that involves other OSU units. The peer committee's evaluation will be provided to the faculty member, who may attach comments, explanations or rebuttal, prior to being forwarded to the unit head.
4. The unit head, after reviewing the dossier and peer committee's evaluation and recommendation, will prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance in each of the assigned areas of responsibility, as well as an overall performance rating. The overall performance will be expressed as *Extraordinary Performance*, *Strong and Positive Performance*, or *Unsatisfactory Performance*.
5. The final dossier and evaluations will be kept in the faculty member's personnel file, and a copy will be submitted to the Dean.

Outcomes

An overall performance rating for the five-year review period will be determined using the following three levels: Extraordinary Performance, Strong and Positive Performance, or Unsatisfactory Performance. It is expected that only five-year performance records that stand out from the rank group and which are conspicuously marked by distinction will be considered "Extraordinary." This rating would require high levels of sustained performance per faculty member's position description. Similarly, faculty performance that shows a sustained record of deficient performance per faculty member's job description will be considered "Unsatisfactory."

"Extraordinary" Performance: The department and/or college will publicly acknowledge faculty whose performance is deemed Extraordinary and will consider the post-tenure review outcome in awarding merit raises at the next available opportunity for such raises. In addition, faculty receiving a rating of Extraordinary will receive a one-time monetary supplement of \$3,000.

"Strong and Positive" Performance: The department and/or college will consider the post-tenure review outcome in awarding merit and fully satisfactory performance raises at the next available opportunity.

"Unsatisfactory" Performance: Should the peer committee and the unit head agree that the results of a five-year review indicate that a faculty member's record is unsatisfactory, the unit head in consultation with the peer committee and the faculty member under review, will draft a professional development plan. This plan will include definite steps to be taken to remedy the specific deficiencies and to provide realistic support for accomplishing the goals of the development plan. The plan shall be approved by the responsible dean(s). A timetable of no longer than three years will be provided to accomplish the goals of the plan, with annual monitoring by the unit head and peer review committee to measure progress.

Discipline or dismissal for cause, are not part of the post-tenure review. The consequences of continued unsatisfactory performance are outlined in *The Faculty Handbook*. The unit head and the dean bear the responsibility for documenting a case of continued unsatisfactory performance and/or failure to achieve the goals of the development plan resulting from a post-tenure review.

Appendix H - Tenure for Instructors

Recommendations of Issue Group on Tenure Policies for Senior Instructors

Charge:

Review OSU's current policies and to recommend changes in policy that would bring greater clarity and consistency to tenure decisions being made regarding Senior Instructors

Recommendations:

- Tenure for senior instructor will only be considered for those positions originally defined as tenure-track, with an expectation that the position had been filled through a national search
- Creation of tenure-track instructor positions require both college and university level approval
- Position descriptions for tenure-track instructors should include an expectation of professional development and service appropriate to the rank; scholarship may be included within professional development, but is not required for instructor positions

"For instructors [initially hired] with tenure-track appointments, the tenure decision is based primarily on the candidate's performance of assigned duties. Evidence of professional growth appropriate to the position will also be required, possibly but not necessarily including scholarship in the field, in addition to a record of service appropriate to the rank."

- Instructors currently in fixed-term positions can be considered for tenure only if the position was redefined as tenure-track, with similar expectations for a search; assuming that an open national search had been conducted to fill the position initially, a request for waiver of search could be considered (waiver of search is not explicitly mentioned in the proposed policy changes because that option is covered elsewhere in OSU policies and is always a possible option)
- Recognizing that instructors and senior instructors at OSU cover a wide range of specific roles and responsibilities, including but not limited to the instructional program, the word "instructional" has been changed to "academic" in several places
- Promotion to the rank of senior instructor is independent of consideration of tenure; fixed-term instructors may be promoted to senior instructor without indefinite tenure
- Consideration for either promotion or tenure should occur through existing university promotion and tenure processes, with added language to clarify the expectations for professorial rank faculty and instructors/senior instructors

15 May 2002

Appendix I - Notes from meeting with Provost

Promotion & Tenure Discussion

June 3, 2002

Present: Paul Doescher, Angelo Gomez, Shawna Grosskopf, Rakesh Gupta, Jack Higginbotham, Lyla Houglum, Ed Jensen, Gordon Matzke, Janet Nishihara, Mary Powelson, Sabah Randhawa, Nancy Rosenberger, and Tim White

White began by indicating that he felt the system was pretty close to right, but needs to be closer. Four areas need to be reviewed:

1. The position description and the way a job is constructed and the way the job is actually performed sometimes contradict each other. Does the position allow an individual to be successful? Difficult to be distinguished in all areas when if a particular portion of the job amounts to only 10-15%.
2. Ways in which evidence is compiled and disclosed relevant to the criteria. Extension and Library faculty have particular problems in the areas of scholarship, percent of effort and the way the impact of scholarship is described. Gupta noted that the PD's need improvement and that the P&T Committee is making a recommendation related to this in their annual report.
3. Early cases - what is the definition? Should a person in the assistant rank be continually allowed to put their dossier forth until the six years are up? Should the process be changed so that a person can come

up early for tenure, but they are out if unsuccessful? Continues to be confusion between scholarship section of the PD and a vitae. Does it represent scholarship or research? Need to distinguish between the two in the percent section of the PD.

4. How is the effectiveness of the P&T Guidelines measured? Randhawa noted that the new guidelines have been in operation for 6-8 years and that perhaps it is time to evaluate the effectiveness of the guidelines.

Other items

What do we need to do to make it better? a) There needs to be better general communication between the faculty and leadership during dossier preparation, and b) Bring Post-Tenure Review in the process. It was noted that the annual review, and the Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review processes need to be tied together.

Gupta noted there are still faculty who do not know the difference between the University and Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committees - or that there are two separate groups. His goal, as chair, has been to convey the differences in Charges and purpose. It seems that many faculty don't know what happens at the university level. Gupta felt that the current guidelines are comprehensive and inclusive.

Houglum noted that, although the OSU Guidelines continue to be used as a model across the nation, she feels that they should be evaluated. The PD's have improved, but vary from unit to unit - they are better if they are specific to a person rather than for a department. The guidelines state that scholarship does not equal research, although it can lead to research.

Houglum questioned the usefulness of external reviews. External reviews are sometimes more about advocacy than evaluation. Since guidelines at other universities may be different, it may be helpful to communicate with reviewers to let them know what is needed.

Houglum thought it may help to work with departments and college units to help them learn to evaluate dossiers and then work with colleagues.

In marginal cases, what do the annual and mid-course reviews say? OSU has no guidelines for mid-course reviews. Gupta suggested a standard format for annual reviews. Annual reviews are not required in the dossier and should be in the guidelines. Jensen also advocated for standardizing reviews so that the same areas are addressed.

Houglum felt that tenure for the institution is an ongoing issue for the University P&T Committee. Matzke wants tenure for Courtesy faculty addressed. He also noted that some faculty are at a disadvantage if they have a poor mentor.

Gomez questioned whether the current P&T process is serving modern day realities. Do present realities require more flexibility in the number of years they are allowed to be successful? He felt there should be more flexibility in the process.

Gupta also felt that evaluations are gender based and faculty are evaluated against different criteria depending on gender. Gomez questioned whether the P&T process is part of the problem of women and faculty of color advancing below the national level.

Gupta noted that all departments have a different P&T process, as do colleges. He did not suggest standardizing the process, but suggested that each units policies be in writing.

Gomez brought up two additional areas of concern: 1) How individual vs. team-taught scholarly activities are evaluated and 2) How teaching and service are evaluated.

Doescher noted that objectivity of interpretation at unit and college levels vary among different units. There are also instances when personality issues may interfere. Doescher and Powelson recommended a peer committee at the college level - should they be required?

Jensen questioned how someone can be distinguished in areas that account for only 10-15% of their effort. Needs to be a balance between the weight given to teaching, research and service.

Randhawa noted four areas to be reviewed: 1) assessing effectiveness, 2) communication, 3) process issues, and 4) scholarship/job description alignment. Randhawa suggesting forming separate committees to look at these issues. Early cases applies to both junior faculty and experienced faculty coming in from other institutions. White noted the following reasons for going up early: 1) prior teaching at another institution, 2) the faculty member was given a promissory note (i.e., if they finish their Ph.D. and go up, and 3) large egos.

Gupta read a recommended definition from the P&T Committee of those eligible to go up early: Faculty members seeking tenure before five years of service in rank as a full-time tenure track faculty at OSU.

Should a faculty member be allowed to apply for tenure? The recommendation from the P&T Committee is: Faculty members can apply for early tenure if: a) there is a formal agreement for early consideration of tenure when hired and/or b) criteria for granting indefinite tenure - if criteria in guidelines is met (*Rakesh - I don't think I got this right.*)

White suggested that the agreement be with the President or Provost and not a chair. White also suggested that, if a candidate goes up early and is not successful, they enter their terminal year, i.e., they don't get another chance.

Matze questioned whether time should be one of the standards? White noted that it is difficult to attain quality in an early case, i.e., experience gained in working with graduate students. Grosskopf suggested that if an individual insists on early tenure and is not successful, it would be up and out. Matzke suggested defining early tenure as being eligible in year four or five, but not in year one, two or three. Gupta suggested specifying the number of years required at a prior institution combined with the number of years required at OSU to be eligible for early tenure. Can we say that an individual can't initiate early tenure without departmental approval?

Higginbotham noted that a faculty member can pull their dossier at any point up to the point where the Provost makes a decision for tenure. He felt that the option of granting early tenure allows OSU to lure stars away from other institutions; if you don't allow early tenure, it makes stars leave.

Rosenberger assigned the issue of early tenure to the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee to discuss.

Jensen questioned if it was possible to create a standard for each of the P&T areas. White responded that it is too variable among units; it comes down to judgement. Houglum noted it was valuable to talk at the departmental level regarding expectations of scholarship.

Jensen expressed the opinion that it doesn't seem right if a faculty member is supported by the college, but it gets disapproved by the University. He felt that OSU has guidelines, but also needs criteria.

Rosenberger asked the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee to talk about the process and requested that their recommendations come to the EC and then to Randhawa.

[Appendix J - Overview of P&T Process at OSU: Flowchart](#)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2002 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee began its review of 67 dossiers in March and concluded its final meeting on July 31, 2002.

Within this report are tables that summarize requests received and the action taken. The information

presented in Table I analyzes the data for the group as a whole. In Tables II and III, summaries are presented for female and minority candidates. The others provide information on promotion by rank and granting of indefinite tenure. They also show totals by college, including information on females and minorities.

The level of agreement among department, college, and University Promotion and Tenure Committees is high and consistent with the pattern noted in recent years. 19 individuals were promoted to Professor; 15 to Associate Professor; 4 to Associate Professor, Senior Research; 4 to Senior Instructor; and 11 to Senior Faculty Research Assistant. 18 individuals were granted indefinite tenure.

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee consisted of the following individuals:

- Sally Francis, Interim Dean, Graduate School
- Rich Holdren, Vice Provost for Research
- Lyla Houglum, Dean of Extended Education
- Sabah Randhawa, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Tim White, Provost and Executive Vice President, CHAIR

Faculty Observers to the 2002 University Promotion and Tenure Committee were drawn from the Faculty Senate's Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- Shawna Grosskopf, Department of Economics
- Rakesh Gupta, Department of Forest Products, CHAIR
- Jack Higginbotham, Department of Nuclear Engineering/ Research Office
- Charles Langford, Department of Sociology
- Mary Powelson, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology

ANALYSIS BY RANK AND TENURE

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	11	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	4	0	1	1
Associate Professor, Senior Research	4	0	0	0
Associate Professor	15	7	15	6
Professor	19	6	1	0
No change in rank			1	0
TOTAL	53	13	18	7

ANALYSIS FOR WOMEN

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	6	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	3	0	1	1
Associate Professor, Senior Research	1	0	0	0
Associate Professor	10	1	9	1
Professor	7	0	1	0
No change in rank			1	0
TOTAL	26	1	12	2

ANALYSIS FOR MINORITIES

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	0	1	0	0
Senior Instructor	1	0	0	0
Associate Professor, Senior Research	1	1	1	1

Associate Professor	1	0	0	0
Professor	1	0	1	0
TOTAL	4	2	2	1

GRANTED INDEFINITE TENURE

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	2	1	0
Engineering	1	1	0
Health & Human Perf	1	1	0
Home Economics & Ed	2	2	0
Information Services	2	1	0
Liberal Arts	4	2	1
Pharmacy	1	1	1
Science	4	2	0
Veterinary Medicine	1	1	0
TOTAL	18	12	2

PROMOTION TO SENIOR FACULTY RESEARCH ASSISTANT

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	3	2	0
Forestry	2	1	1
Home Economics & Ed	1	1	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sci	2	1	0
Research	1	1	0
Science	2	1	0
Total	11	7	1

PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	1	0	0
Home Economics and Education	1	1	0
Liberal Arts	1	1	1
Science	1	1	0
Total	4	3	1

PROMOTION TO RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Forestry	2	1	1
Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences	1	0	0
Science	1	0	0
Total	4	1	1

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	2	1	0
Engineering 1	1	0	
Health and Human Performance	1	1	0
Home Economics and Education	1	1	0
Information Services	1	1	0
Liberal Arts	3	1	0
Pharmacy	1	1	1
Science	4	2	0
Veterinary Medicine	1	1	0
Total	15	10	1

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	6	0	0
Forestry	1	0	0
Health and Human Performance	1	0	0
Home Economics and Education	4	4	0
Liberal Arts	3	1	0
Pharmacy	1	0	0
Science	2	2	0
Veterinary Medicine	1	0	0
Total	19	8	0

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344

[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)

[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)

Valid [xhtml](#).