

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » 2004-2005 Annual Report

Promotion & Tenure Committee

2004-2005 Annual Report

Members of the 2004-2005 Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee:

Loretta Rielly '05, Chair - Valley Library
Andrea Marks '05 - Art
Barbara Edwards '06 - Mathematics
Margaret Burnett '07 - Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Jun Xing '07 - Ethnic Studies
TBA (v. Lundy) '06
Executive Committee Liaison - Joan Gross

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.

Promotion & Tenure Brown Bags

Two promotion and tenure brown bags were included in the Academic Affairs Faculty Orientation Series. The first was held on September 23, the week before classes began, and was presented by Loretta Rielly, Committee Chair, and Becky Johnson, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs. Attendance was sparse (4 people, including one member of the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee and a representative from Human Resources), probably a result of conflicts with other college and department orientations. The April 7 brown bag was more successful: 20-25 faculty attended. Presenters included Loretta Rielly and two members of the University's Promotion and Tenure Committee: Sally Francis, Dean of the Graduate School, and Rich Holdren, Vice Provost for Research. A streaming video of this and previous brown bags is available on the Faculty Senate [Promotion and Tenure Committee web page](#). A flow chart documenting the process is posted on the [academic affairs webpage](#).

Recommendation: The promotion and tenure brown bags sponsored by Academic Affairs are important opportunities for faculty to ask questions of the university promotion and tenure committee members and

should be scheduled during the academic year, ideally in fall and spring terms.

Promotion & Tenure Study

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee is collaborating on a study of faculty experiences with OSU's promotion and tenure with the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and the Association of Faculty for the Advancement of People of Color. The study will consist of individual interviews, focus groups, and is expected to be concluded by Fall 2005.

Faculty Senate President Jeffrey Hale asked the Promotion and Tenure Committee to consider ways to address the issue of faculty service in tenure and promotion decisions, especially in light of university initiatives that rely on faculty participation. The Committee recommends that this be addressed in conjunction with the promotion and tenure study since it is a theme that has emerged in the study's planning.

Post-Tenure Review

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee forwarded a charge from Becky Johnson, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs, to assess the effectiveness of the Post-Tenure Review process. Issues presented by the Provost and Johnson include:

1. Despite the requirement that all tenured faculty be reviewed by a peer committee at intervals no longer than five years, there are still units that have not done any post-tenure reviews and others that have done them sporadically. Are there some suggestions for ensuring compliance without putting undue administrative burdens on departments?
2. For faculty whose performance is less than satisfactory, a professional development plan must be established. The plan should specify the resources to be made available to accomplish the goals. What is the responsibility of the Department, College, and University, respectively, to provide those resources?
3. PTR requires a review by a faculty member's peers. In the case of a less than satisfactory result, the faculty member and those peers must work together in the future. How can we implement the PTR process in a way that preserves positive working relationships and has the least negative impact on a faculty member's morale?
4. Are the guidelines clear enough on what "less than satisfactory" means, or should this be left up to units? In particular, will less than satisfactory performance in any of the three areas (teaching, research, or service) trigger a development plan?
5. What consequences should result if the faculty member fails to achieve all of the goals identified in his/her development plan? Are those consequences clear enough in the guidelines?

Since the charge was received in May, the assessment will be conducted by the 2005/2006 P&T Committee.

Observation of University P&T Committee

Each member of the FS P&T committee observed one or more tenure and promotion cases being considered by the University P&T Committee. In general, members of this committee felt the process was thorough and the university committee members were well-prepared, consistent, and asked appropriate, and necessary, questions of the deans and department chairs. Following these observations, the FS P&T Committee met to share general observations.

Communication

The thread that connects the issues identified below is communication. How are expectations communicated to faculty? What processes are in place to assure that faculty receive mentoring, assistance, and advice? Is this consistent throughout the departments and colleges? Consistent and ongoing communication with faculty about expectations, standards, and processes is critical. Mixed messages, or misunderstood messages from department chairs, and/or deans create unnecessary hurdles for candidates.

Procedures

Questions about procedural matters were raised this year, including the impact of signing waivers, stopping-the-clock, agreements regarding prior service, and early tenure. Guidelines for these appear inconsistent and may not be clearly communicated. It's important that faculty understand their options and that these are consistently communicated. Some of these are covered in the P&T Commonly Asked Questions, others are not. Updating these and assuring that they are communicated throughout the campus should be a priority.

Service

What kinds of service are expected of faculty? Do some kinds of service hold more value than others? The importance of service varies from college to college and it's critical that the candidate understand what's expected of her/him and that this information is included in position descriptions.

Scholarship

Expectations as to quantity and quality of scholarship vary between colleges and, at times, within a college. How are these expectations communicated? How are standards articulated? Types of scholarship vary as well, and a number of the cases requiring clarification were joint or extension appointments. The broad definition of scholarship at OSU enriches our campus, and the university committee should be commended for ensuring that various types of scholarship are rewarded. Still, the burden is on the departments and colleges to reflect this through their position descriptions and for communicating this to their faculty committees to assure that each candidate is assessed on the expectations for her/his position within the university.

Outside evaluations

The relationship between outside evaluator and candidate was cause for some concern in some cases, blurring the line between evaluation and advocacy.

6/30/2005

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
2005 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY**

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee began its review of 95 dossiers in March and concluded its final meeting on June 14, 2005.

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. Twenty-nine individuals were promoted to Professor; 1 to Professor, Senior Research; 28 to Associate Professor, 3 to Associate Professor, Senior Research; 8 to Senior Instructor; and 8 to Senior Faculty Research Assistant. Forty-one individuals were granted indefinite tenure.

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

- Sally Francis, Dean, Graduate School
- Rich Holdren, Senior Associate Vice President for Research
- Becky Johnson, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs & International Programs
- Kelvin Koong, Interim Dean and Director of OSU Extension Service
- Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President

Faculty Observers to the 2005 University Promotion and Tenure Committee were drawn from the Faculty Senate's Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- Margaret Burnett, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
- Barbara Edwards, Department of Mathematics
- Jun Xing, Department of Ethnic Studies
- Andrea Marks, Department of Art
- Loretta Rielly, OSU Libraries, CHAIR

ANALYSIS BY RANK AND TENURE

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	8	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	8	0	1	0

Associate Professor, Senior Research	3	1	0	0
Associate Professor	28	7	31	3
Professor, Senior Research	1	0	0	0
Professor	29	3	4	0
No change in rank	0	0	5	2
Total	77	11	41	5

ANALYSIS FOR FEMALES

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	2	0	0	0
Senior Instructor	5	0	0	0
Associate Professor, Senior Research	1	1	0	0
Associate Professor	16	2	17	0
Professor, Senior Research	0	0	0	0
Professor	9	1	2	0
No change in rank	--	--	2	2
Total	33	4	21	2

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	1	0	0	0
Associate Professor	6	2	8	0
Professor, Senior Research	0	0	0	0
Professor	3	1	0	0
No change in rank	--	--	1	0
Total	11	3	9	0

GRANTED INDEFINITE TENURE

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	11	7	4
Business	2	0	0
Education	3	3	1
Engineering	3	0	0
Forestry	2	0	1
Health and Human Sciences	3	2	1
Liberal Arts	9	4	2
Library	2	2	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	3	1	0

Pharmacy	1	1	0
Science	2	1	0
Total	41	21	9

PROMOTION TO SENIOR FACULTY RESEARCH ASSISTANT

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	4	1	0
Forestry	2	0	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	1	1	0
Science	1	0	0
Total	8	2	0

PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Education	1	1	0
Engineering	1	0	0
Forestry	1	1	0
Pharmacy	1	1	0
Science	4	2	1
Total	8	5	1

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SENIOR RESEARCH

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	2	1	1
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	1	0	0
Total	3	1	1

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	7	5	3
Business	1	0	0
Education	2	2	0
Engineering	2	0	0
Forestry	1	0	1
Health and Human Sciences	3	2	1
Liberal Arts	8	4	1
Library	2	2	0
Science	2	1	0
Total	28	16	6

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	3	2	0
Business	1	0	0
Education	2	2	0
Engineering	4	1	1
Forestry	4	0	0
Health and Human Sciences	1	1	0
Liberal Arts	4	1	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	3	1	0
Pharmacy	1	0	0
Science	6	1	2
Total	29	9	3

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR, SENIOR RESEARCH

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	1	0	0
Total	1	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](#).