

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 2002-2003

Promotion & Tenure Committee

2002-2003 Annual Report

Members of the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee were:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Dan Arp, Chair, Botany and Plant Pathology | College of Ag. Sciences (2005) |
| 2. Andrea Marks, Art | College of Liberal Arts (2005) |
| 3. Mary Powelson, Botany and Plant Pathology | College of Ag. Sci. (2003, ret. 12/02) |
| 4. Jack Higginbotham, Nuclear Engineering | College of Engineering (2003) |
| 5. Charles Langford, Sociology | College of Liberal Arts (2004) |
| 6. Loretta Rielly, Library | Library (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 and 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.

I. Recommendation Regarding Post-Tenure Review

Responding to a concern brought to our attention by Doug Derryberry, President of the American Association of University Professors, we considered the current categories used to rank professors in the Post-Tenure Review process. The current categories are "Extraordinary" Performance, "Strong and Positive" Performance, and "Unsatisfactory" Performance. President Derryberry noted that the scale is unbalanced because it lacks a neutral point that reflects "competent, conscientious" performance. The FS P&T committee agreed with this concern and recommends that an additional category be added for "Satisfactory" Performance. We propose the following addition to the Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review:

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

II. Response to a concern brought to us by the Faculty Status Committee

The Faculty Status Committee raised an issue regarding the rules for voting eligibility on matters of promotion and tenure within a particular unit. The committee felt that it was within the purview of the units to develop their own rules for voting eligibility, providing those rules were agreed upon and understood by

the members of the unit and were consistent with University guidelines.

III. Observation of University Promotion & Tenure Committee

Each member of the FS P&T Committee sat in on the discussion of from two to seven cases. In general, the committee felt that the process that we observed worked well. We were impressed with the depth of the review. The members of the University committee were well prepared and had clearly taken the time to carefully review the dossiers. The Deans responding to questions from the committee were given adequate time to respond to questions and to clarify reasons behind a decision.

At the completion of the meetings with the University P&, the FS P&T came together to discuss our observations. We did not discuss specific cases, rather, we looked for overarching themes or trends in the kinds of issues that arose. Most of the cases dealt with questions of scholarship and considerations of both the quality and quantity of scholarship.

- Quality of Scholarship. It is apparent that there continue to be difficulties in defining or measuring the quality of scholarship. Different disciplines have different norms for what constitutes a measure of quality. For example, publications from and presentations at meetings hold more importance for some disciplines than for others. Journal qualities also vary, and determining the rank or impact of a journal often required additional input.

The implementation of the "broader definition of scholarship" adopted by the University several years ago also continues to bring challenges.

- Quantity of Scholarship. In several cases, the quantity of scholarship was at issue. This concern was especially noted in cases where the Position Description included many duties in addition to scholarship, such as heavy teaching assignments, administrative roles, program direction, serving as a liaison, etc.
- Mentoring. In some cases, there was a question of whether or not the candidate had received appropriate or useful mentoring from unit P&T committees and unit heads. A related concern was whether or not the candidate had received a consistent message.
- Recommendations. The FS P&T committee did not formulate specific recommendations to address the issues that were raised. With regard to quality of scholarship, it is apparent that units and colleges need to be vigilant in addressing the basis for their determinations regarding quality of scholarship. Quantity of scholarship should be linked to the Position Description, but candidates should receive clear and consistent messages from the time of hiring to the time of dossier consideration. The message should be as specific as possible, including examples of what constitutes acceptable scholarship for the particular unit.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2002-03 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee began its review of 74 dossiers in March and concluded its final meeting on May 6, 2003.

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. 25 individuals were promoted to Professor; 2 to Professor (Courtesy), 23 to Associate Professor; 5 to Associate Professor, Senior Research; 4 to Senior Instructor; and 6 to Senior Faculty Research Assistant. 30 individuals were granted indefinite tenure.

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

- Leslie Burns, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Sally Francis, Dean, Graduate School
- Rich Holdren, Vice Provost for Research
- Lyla Houglum, Dean of Extension
- Sabah Randhawa, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President, CHAIR

Faculty Observers to the 2003 University Promotion and Tenure Committee were drawn from the Faculty Senate's Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- Dan Arp, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, CHAIR
- Jack Higginbotham, Department of Nuclear Engineering/ Research Office
- Charles Langford, Department of Sociology
- Andrea Marks, Department of Art
- Fred Obermiller, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
- Loretta Rielly, OSU Libraries

ANALYSIS BY RANK AND TENURE

Request by rank	Promotion	Tenure		Denied
	Yes	No	Granted	
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	6	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	4	0	0	0
Associate Professor, Senior Research	5	0	0	0
Associate Professor	23	7	28	1
Professor (Courtesy)	2	0	0	0
Professor	25	1	1	0
No change in rank			1	0
Total	65	8	30	1

ANALYSIS FOR FEMALES

Request by rank	Promotion	Tenure		Denied
	Yes	No	Granted	
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	3	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	1	0	0	0
Associate Professor, Senior Research	2	0	0	0
Associate Professor	8	2	9	0
Professor (Courtesy)	0	0	0	0
Professor	10	0	1	0
No change in rank			0	0
Total	24	2	10	0

ANALYSIS FOR MINORITIES

Request by rank	Promotion	Tenure		Denied
	Yes	No	Granted	

Senior Faculty Research Assistant	0	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	0	0	0	0
Associate Professor, Senior Research	2	0	0	0
Associate Professor	5	3	7	0
Professor (Courtesy)	0	0	0	0
Professor	1	0	0	0
No change in rank			0	0
Total	8	3	7	0

GRANTED INDEFINITE TENURE

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	5	0	0
Business	1	0	1
Education	4	2	1
Engineering	3	0	2
Forestry	1	0	0
Health and Human Sciences	2	1	0
Information Services	1	1	0
Liberal Arts	8	3	3
Science	2	1	0
Veterinary Medicine	3	2	0
Total	30	10	7

PROMOTION TO SENIOR FACULTY RESEARCH ASSISTANT

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	2	1	0
Engineering	1	0	0
Research Office	2	2	0
Science	1	0	0
Total	6	3	0

PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	2	0	0
Education	1	1	0
Science	1	0	0
Total	4	1	0

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SENIOR RESEARCH

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	1	1	1
Business	2	1	1
Forestry	1	0	0
Research Office	1	0	0
Total	5	2	2

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	2	0	0
Business	1	0	1
Education	3	2	1
Engineering	3	0	2
Forestry	1	0	0
Health and Human Sciences	2	1	0
Information Services	1	1	0
Liberal Arts	5	1	1
Science	2	1	0
Veterinary Medicine	3	2	0
Total	23	8	5

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	10	3	0
Business	2	0	0
Engineering	2	1	1
Forestry	3	1	0
Liberal Arts	3	3	0
Science	5	2	0
Total	25	10	1

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR (COURTESY)

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	1	0	0
Science	1	0	0
Total	2	0	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](#).