

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » 2003-2004 Annual Report

Promotion & Tenure Committee

2003-2004 Annual Report

Members of the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee were:

Dan Arp, Chair, Botany and Plant Pathology	College of Ag. Sciences (2004)
Andrea Marks, Art	College of Liberal Arts (2005)
Barbara Edwards, Mathematics	College of Science (2007)
James Lundy, CCE Engineering	College of Engineering (2007)
Charles Langford, Sociology	College of Liberal Arts (2004)
Loretta Rielly, Library	Library (2004)
Fred Obermiller, AREC	College of Ag. Sciences (ad hoc)

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.

I. Response to a charge from the Faculty Senate President

In the Fall Quarter, we received the following charge from Bruce Sorte, Faculty Senate President: 1) Evaluate the effectiveness of tenure at OSU over the past 20 years and how it compares with similar land-grant universities across the U.S. Provide an assessment of how the budget reduction process may impact indefinite tenure at OSU.

2) Consider the usefulness of the "Institutional Procedures and Criteria for Unit or Program Reduction or Elimination" with and without the changes which have been recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as a means whereby faculty can participate in the decision-making process for programmatic adjustments. Suggest additional changes as needed.

Our report in response to this charge is appended to this document.

II. Observation of University P&T 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 and Unit Heads/Chairs responding to questions from the committee were given adequate time to respond to questions and to clarify reasons behind a recommendation.

At the completion of the meetings with the University P&T, 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.

Scholarship. One of the most vexing challenges continues to be determining what constitutes sufficient scholarship to warrant promotion. Both quality and quantity are issues, as are differences in standards across disciplines, and even within a unit or discipline. The problem is most serious when deans and unit chairs/heads appear to have different standards (or expectations) for scholarship or service.

Position Descriptions. The University P&T committee is committed to basing evaluations on the position description. We agree with this overall approach, but recognize that it raises some concerns. For example, a 40% teaching load in one unit can consist of 2 courses, while the same 40% effort can consist of 5 courses in another unit. Another concern is how the percentages then get played out in the evaluation. If teaching or outreach is the primary activity, how much scholarship is needed when it constitutes 10% of the position description, rather than 60% for a lighter teaching load? Should the position description be allowed to change prior to evaluation? How close to evaluation? Should evaluation be based on a composite of the position descriptions since last evaluation, or only the most recent position description?

"Collegiality" and "Generosity." Collegiality is expected of professors, but this trait is difficult to evaluate. Generosity is considered a valuable trait in a colleague (generous with time in helping colleagues, serving the University, etc.), but also one that can take away from time devoted to scholarship. How does one balance these desired traits-collegiality and generosity-with the need to be self-centered and devote time and energy to scholarship?

Teaching. Teaching is considered seriously by the University P&T committee, as it should be. Evaluation, however, does seem susceptible to some errors based on common indicators. For example, Student Evaluation of Teaching scores are given considerable weight. However, low scores can indicate an instructor who doesn't care, or who cares but is ineffective or poorly organized. But low scores can also indicate that a professor challenges the students beyond their comfort level. Solicitations of letters from past students can have very low response rates, such that one disgruntled student can have a disproportionate impact. We consider peer evaluations one of the strongest indicators of teaching effectiveness, but one which is not used evenly across units and for which, again, standards are not available.

Report on outcomes of Promotion and Tenure, 2004

Report on the Status of Tenure at OSU

January 22, 2004

Prepared by Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Senate
Dan Arp (Chair), Loretta Rielly, James Lundy, Charles Langford, Fred Obermiller, Barbara Edwards

On October 1, 2003, Bruce Sorte, President of the Faculty Senate, gave the following charge to the Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee:

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of tenure at OSU over the past 20 years and how it compares with similar land-grant universities across the U.S. Provide an assessment of how the budget reduction process may impact indefinite tenure at OSU.
2. Consider the usefulness of the "Institutional Procedures and Criteria for Unit or Program Reduction or Elimination" with and without the changes which have been recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as a means whereby faculty can participate in the decision-making process for programmatic adjustments. Suggest additional changes as needed.

To address point #1 of the charge, the Committee started with the idea to gather information from three sources: 1) other universities, 2) the published literature, and 3) Oregon State University. For other universities, we started with the web sites of six of our comparator institutions. We looked for news releases, committee reports, university policies and procedures relating to promotion and tenure. While we were able to uncover some interesting information, we found it difficult to compare the information from institution to institution. Different titles for similar categories of faculty, different ways of reporting, etc., led us to the "apples vs. oranges" dilemma. The published literature on tenure is overwhelming and not necessarily relevant to OSU circumstances. Within OSU, we considered several vehicles for gathering information on faculty attitudes towards tenure, including a survey of faculty. However, given the tight time line and limited resources, we took a convenience sample of the faculty, which tried to include a great variety of disciplines and academic ranks. As might be expected, the anecdotes covered the spectrum from severe concerns about the challenge to tenure created by the way in which Extension handled its budget shortfall, to a lack of knowledge about Extension and, therefore, no basis to conclude that anything about tenure had changed in the last year.

Given the difficulty in taking a "data informed" approach, we migrated towards the idea that each member of the committee brings their own beliefs, experiences, and opinions to the table and that these, collectively, offer a representative view of the status of tenure at OSU. And, collectively, we are of the opinion that the handling of the Extension reductions did constitute a challenge to tenure at OSU. If tenure held primacy over other concerns, then one would have expected that tenured professors would have the greatest employment security, followed by non-tenured and then fixed-term faculty when the Extension resources were found to be insufficient to cover the current FTE. That was not the case, as some fixed-term faculty found themselves "most qualified" for certain job descriptions that remained after Extension went through their FTE reduction process, while some tenured faculty found themselves with no remaining job description that matched their qualifications. We recognize that the challenges facing Extension were immense, but if Extension can make program reductions that do not place tenure as the primary criterion for retention of faculty, then we wonder about the security of tenure in other colleges in the face of similar or even less severe budget constraints.

In expressing our concerns about the challenge to tenure, we recognize that we have the luxury (and the responsibility) to focus our attention only on the question of the primacy of tenure in the face of program reductions. Protecting tenure against all other concerns may not always be in the best interests of OSU. But allowing tenure to be weakened at OSU is certainly not in the best long-term interests of OSU.

In our research and discussions, we were reminded of another threat to tenure. There is a trend across institutions of higher education in the US to place an increased proportion of the teaching effort on part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty (see appended document). Clearly, directing resources to fixed-term instructors results in fewer appointments into tenure track positions.

To address point #2 of our charge, we read and discussed the "Institutional Procedures and Criteria for Unit or Program Reduction or Elimination" with the changes proposed by the Executive Committee and compared this to the current document. The document used currently has been found procedurally wanting in some of the recent reductions that have taken place. In other cases, it seems to have worked well. We appreciate the efforts of those involved in drafting the revisions of the document. However, we raise the following concerns:

- The document has become too detailed. There seems to be an attempt to find the words to deal with any foreseeable situation. However, each situation will be unique and will require some interpretation of the document, regardless of the level of detail in the document.
- The role of the FCG as distinct from that of the Administration is not always clear. It would be useful to reorganize the document to indicate the responsibility of the FCG as well as that of the administration, and to delineate the generally agreed-upon principles used by all. For example, shared governance would seem to be the most important principle upon which to base the document.
- In some reductions, the input from the faculty has seemingly come too late in the process to have a meaningful impact. It's not clear that the revised document will fix this concern.

In our discussions, we wondered if the processes used in state governance might not provide a model for how to proceed. A legislative statute provides a mandate to a state agency, but it is then up to the agency to implement the mandate. The agency must defend its implementation plan, and ultimately the implementation itself, to the legislature. In the case of program reductions or eliminations, we might imagine something similar to the statute—a succinct document that indicates who has responsibility for reductions and eliminations and the principles that are used to make the reductions. It is then up to the administrator responsible for the reductions or eliminations to devise an implementation plan and to defend the reasons for the reductions or eliminations, the criteria used in making the decision, etc. The administrator would need to defend the plan to the faculty, most likely via the FCG. Much of the information currently included in the

reduction/elimination document could be placed as appendices-as useful guidelines for selection of criteria, values, etc. Admittedly, this idea is rough, but we wanted to share it with the Executive Committee to see if it resonates.

Appendix: Published information about Tenure.

This information was collected by Loretta Rielly, Library Services and member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Since most of the publications that address tenure are from the AAUP, there's a great deal of redundancy and understandable defensiveness. The concerns are:

- Financial expediency rather than financial exigency is driving personnel decisions, with an increase in the number of part-time, non-tenure track positions and a decrease in full-time positions.
- Business models and attention to external customers detracts from the educational and research missions.
- Academic freedom provides protection for voicing ... and
- Shared governance and faculty oversight of the academic mission of the university.

The June 2001 report of the NEA Higher Education Research Center Update finds that "increasing use of part-time faculty members, most of whom are not tenured, is undercutting the tenure system. The evidence for an increasing number of non-tenured full-time faculty members is more equivocal."

AAUP website: <http://www.aaup.org/>

Useful excerpts:

OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines: Criteria for Granting Indefinite Tenure

Tenure ensures the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the free search for truth and the attainment of excellence in the University. But in addition, tenure also reflects and recognizes a candidate's potential long-term value to the institution, as evidenced by professional performance and growth. Tenure sets universities apart from other institutions. Faculty are not merely employed by the University but are the educational and research programs of the University; tenured faculty are the community of educators who create institutional stability and an ongoing commitment to excellence. Tenure, therefore, will be granted to faculty members whose character, achievements in serving the University's missions, and potential for effective long-term performance warrant the institution's reciprocal long-term commitment. The granting of tenure is more significant than promotion in academic rank.

Mary Burgan, "A Profession in Difficult Times," **Liberal Education**. Fall 1999.

[Tenure and governance] are the practical instruments for the achievement of truth, of freedom, of professional autonomy, and of community.

ISU AAUP, "White Paper #1--Tenure." No date.

Data compiled by AAUP: the proportion of full-time professors working on contracts rose from 19 percent in 1975 to 28 percent in 1995, while the proportion of those on the tenure track fell from 29 percent to 20 percent. Part-timers now make up an estimated 42 percent of instructors in U.S. colleges and universities.

James F. Slevin, "Preserving Critical Faculties," Liberal Education, Summer 2000.

Educators have to be both aware of and free of a concern with their students' pre-existing needs and their institution's goals, in order to make any difference to either. Educators also have to be free of the needs defined by those outside the academy, whose demands and pressures all too easily reduce the significant

consequences of education into outcomes designed to meet narrowly-defined corporate needs, thereby diminishing the possibilities of genuine learning and the intellectual life. Not simply sustaining but encouraging this freedom is why tenure matters. (p. 3-4 on print out)

The protection of academic freedom--indeed, the active and positive encouragement of dissent--is the heart of the college and university, though unwelcome at the diploma market. Efforts at change that lead to the elimination of this protection (like the hiring practices just described, often rationalized as better serving the mission of the institution by giving it "flexibility") are destructive and need to be actively fought. (p 5)

Tenure, we might argue, supports first and foremost the values making possible the intellectual work of those it protects. Any changes we propose are intended to strengthen the support for the values underlying that work, even as these changes take into account a wider range of places where the work happens and needs protecting.

In fact, I would go one step further and argue that expanding the domains where tenure-earning intellectual work can be done (to include, in serious ways, teaching and service) is crucial to **preserving** the underlying values of knowledge creation, exchange, and questioning. These values are increasingly endangered because, for example, as non-tenure-line **faculty** assume the duties of teaching, the vigor of their questioning and the courage of their dissent can be suppressed--and so their integrity compromised. In short, we need to expand the domains of tenure-earning **faculty** work in order to stay the erosion of the central values of academic life. (p 6)

Cites data from 1998 AFT report:

-- While the total number of full-time **faculty** grew marginally and slowly--49 percent between 1970 and 1995 (2 percent per year)--the number of part-time **faculty** has increased dramatically, 266 percent (10.6 percent per year) over the same period. At this rate, part-time **faculty** will outnumber full-time by the academic year 2001.

-- At least 43 percent of American **faculty** are now part-time, up from 38 percent in 1987. Only 57 percent of **faculty** are full-time. In the community colleges, only about 37 percent of **faculty** are full-time.

-- In 1995, 51 percent of the new full-time **faculty** appointed did not receive a tenure-eligible position, meaning they became short-term, year-to-year instructors. Newly appointed full-time **faculty** in 1995 totaled 3,772 fewer than in 1993, an 11 percent decrease. In comparison with 1989, the decline in new hires is even sharper: 10,372 fewer new appointments were made in 1996--a 25 percent difference.

-- The proportion of full-time **faculty** on term contracts grew from 19 percent in 1975 to 28 percent in 1995. During this time, the number of full-time instructors on the tenure track decreased by 12 percent.

SOURCE: "The Vanishing Professor" (American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C. 1998)

Ernest Benjamin, "Some Implications of Tenure for the Profession and Society," AAUP Professional integrity includes not only ideological autonomy but the right to exercise academic judgment. It is the latter which those who seek to manage faculty would constrain. Consider the following: "Changes in how the faculty regard themselves and their institutions lie at the heart of the restructuring process. What faculty are being asked to do is return--in effect, to give back--a portion of their independence and ability to define their own tasks and performance standards. [Policy Perspectives, Pew Higher Education Research Program, February 1993, Vol. 4, No.4; p. 9A.] (p. 5 on printout)

Higher education without tenure would in time become a system of training schools whose instructors were neither educators nor scholars. For the notion that one can improve the university by destroying tenure ultimately presupposes that one can maintain the university without attracting or sustaining the teacher-scholar. On the contrary, tenure alone enables faculty to preserve their professional integrity and the creative conflict essential to the advancement of learning amid the intensifying institutional constraints of contemporary higher education. (p. 6)

James T. Richardson, "Tenure in the New Millenium," National Forum. Winter 1999. America needs to attract its best minds to the academic profession, something that will continue to happen only if such individuals think they can have productive, secure careers. Academia without academic freedom will not seem attractive to those whom our society needs to contribute to its future knowledge base and maintain our system of higher education. The hour is late for rethinking what we are collectively doing and allowing to happen to higher education in the United States. I hope it is not too late to change course and

move again toward the protection of academic freedom as a hallowed value, with all the good things that flow from such a decision for our democratic society. (p. 5 on printout)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2004 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee began its review of 64 dossiers in March and concluded its final meeting on April 28, 2004. 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. 15 individuals were promoted to Professor; 26 to Associate Professor, 1 to Associate Professor (Courtesy), 2 Associate Professor, Senior Research; 1 to Senior Instructor; and 11 to Senior Faculty Research Assistant. 23 individuals were granted indefinite tenure. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee consisted of the following individuals:

- Sally Francis, Dean, Graduate School
- Rich Holdren, Vice Provost for Research
- Lyla Houglum, Dean of Extension
- Sabah Randhawa, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs & International Programs
- Timothy White, Provost and Executive Vice President, CHAIR

Faculty Observers to the 2004 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
- Barbara Edwards, Department of Mathematics
- Charles Langford, Department of Sociology
- Jim Lundy, Department of Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering
- Andrea Marks, Department of Art
- Loretta Rielly, OSU Libraries

ANALYSIS BY RANK AND TENURE

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	11	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	1	0	0	0
Associate Professor, Senior Research	2	0	0	0
Associate Professor	26	5	22	5
Associate Professor (Courtesy)	1	0	0	0
Professor	15	3	1	1
No change in rank	0	0	0	1
Total	56	8	23	7

ANALYSIS FOR FEMALES

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	4	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	1	0	0	0

Associate Professor, Senior Research	1	0	0	0
Associate Professor	13	1	11	1
Associate Professor (Courtesy)	1	0	0	0
Professor	8	1	0	0
No change in rank	0	0	0	0
Total	28	2	11	1

ANALYSIS FOR MINORITIES

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

GRANTED INDEFINITE TENURE

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	8	5	1
Business	2	0	0
Education	2	1	0
Engineering	2	1	0
Liberal Arts	3	3	1
Science	4	1	2
Veterinary Medicine	2	0	1
Total	23	11	5

PROMOTION TO SENIOR FACULTY RESEARCH ASSISTANT

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	4	2	0
Forestry	3	0	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	1	0	0
Research Office	3	2	0
Total	11	4	0

PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
International Programs	1	1	1
Total	1	1	1

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SENIOR RESEARCH

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

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	8	5	1
Business	1	0	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	2	0	0
Education	2	1	0
Engineering	2	1	0
Health and Human Sciences	1	1	0
Liberal Arts	4	4	1
Science	5	1	2
Veterinary Medicine	1	0	0
Total	26	13	4

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	2	0	0
Engineering	3	1	0
Forestry	2	1	0
Health and Human Sciences	2	2	0
Liberal Arts	2	2	0
Science	3	2	1
Veterinary Medicine	1	0	1
Total	15	8	2

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (COURTESY)

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Science	1	1	0

Total	1	1	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](#).