

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » 2005-2006 Annual Report

Promotion & Tenure Committee

2005-2006 Annual Report

This was a particularly active year for the Promotion and Tenure Committee, with a number of important charges handed to us at the beginning of the year. In addition, other ongoing discussions intersected our purview (e.g. the review of P&T by AFAPC) during the year.

At the beginning of the year (July 2006), the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee was given three specific charges:

- Examine the guidelines in face of the creation of fixed-term extension faculty
- Role and expectations for service in P&T
- Review the post tenure review process

In addition, a number of proposed revisions to the guidelines developed by an ad hoc committee last year (chaired by Becky Johnson) were passed to us in August 2006. These revisions were designed to address a number of issues that had arisen over the previous several years with respect to the existing guidelines.

In the sections below, I will discuss what the committee's actions were on each of the items. Additional information exists as part of other Faculty Senate meeting minutes and will not be reproduced here (I have tried to reference appropriate documents).

Original Charges

Examine the guidelines in face of the creation of fixed-term extension faculty

This charge represented the major focus of our efforts this year. The extent of the resultant revisions had less to do with the specific issue (fixed-term extension faculty) than with the discovery was that different units within the university were using very different methodologies for describing their positions. It was the judgment of our committee that that disparity in process put fixed-term faculty in a particularly vulnerable position, and needed to be addressed if we were to successfully complete our charge.

In effect, our P&T guidelines and merit evaluation are based on individual position descriptions. However, previous to this year there existed no internally consistent set of guidelines or definitions to help unit supervisors write them. The specific result of this divergence in methodology was that some units were using terms such as Research completely differently from others. Our first goal as a committee was therefore to develop a set of internally consistent definitions for the duties that make up faculty positions. This year we focused primarily on Research, Extension, Other Assignments and Service.

A separate document was written and presented to the faculty senate that describes the nature of the changes to the guidelines and the guidelines for position descriptions. Slightly updated versions of those documents are attached to this report.

Role of separate documents on position description guidelines

It is important to re-iterate here that one of our major accomplishments this year was the generation of the first several drafts of guidelines for what constitutes appropriate components of a position description, and who is responsible for its construction. We developed this document originally to be part of the guidelines - in collaboration with Academic Affairs and University Legal Counsel.

At the end of the process (early spring), Legal Counsel advised us that such information belonged outside of the guidelines. This decision began a series of conversations about who should take the leadership in providing a uniform method for writing position descriptions to the university community. Our committee's recommendation is that it should be Academic Affairs, with collaboration from the FS P&T committee and affirmation from FS executive committee. It represents a management (practice) issue rather than a guidelines issue.

Role and expectations for service in P&T

The committee made a number of alterations in the guidelines to emphasize the role of service, and accepted slightly altered changes from the ad hoc committee chaired by Becky Johnson last summer. The changes we proposed include:

- Definition of institutional (unit and university) and professional service
- Emphasis on accountability for faculty service duties and importance for all faculty to participate
- Definition of peer validated professional service as scholarship
- A recommendation was made for all faculty to have some unspecified % FTE for service in their position descriptions. That was further specified in the separate document on position description criteria.
- Clarification of what types of service can be considered for P&T. This section puts greater emphasis for community service outside the university that promotes the university mission.

Things we discussed but did not recommend:

We considered specific minimum % FTE for service – we felt that was too formulaic. Instead, we recommended that position descriptions be configured to represent time spent doing the specific task/duty. This remains somewhat controversial in some units, where a metric of “value” of the task or duty has been traditionally used. Our committee feels that the university community needs to use some basic, common metrics for speaking of our positions.

Post-tenure review

The original goal of post tenure review was for all tenured faculty to be reviewed every 5 years by a peer committee from within the unit. To date, some departments have not done the review at all (since 2001). Our committee was asked “could the current process be fixed without causing an undue burden on the units”? In short, the answer is no.

Our first task, done by last year’s committee (2005-06) was to collect information on the current processes being used in a number of units. We discovered that many units did not do anything other than standard merit review, and used that as the post tenure review. Others are conducting a full review that is similar to a P&T review. However, there are so few consequences, and the process is so labor intensive, few units will attempt to use it to address problem faculty.

It was the committee’s opinion that the current system cannot be fixed. In effect, great effort is being expended with no hard evidence that any of the original goals are being met. The committee recommendation is below.

Observations from P&T cycle

Many of the observations made in this cycle by our committee members were consistent with the following:

Problem cases often combined mediocre performance of the candidate with:

- poor preparation of the case by the unit,
- separation of the candidate from campus (off site) and poor communication of goals/PD workload,
- complex position description, and
- bad/late advice from a supervisor – example – repeated good reviews based on a mediocre record.

Most of these problems are traceable to management practices rather than to the guidelines. An exception relates to the position descriptions, where there were no existing guidelines on how to write them. In addition, many units have no specific benchmarks for promotion or tenure. Faculty have little idea, independent of what they are told during their annual review or by their unit colleagues, of what is required of them.

On a broader theme, we as a community should decide on what our goals are in the overall process. Are we attempting to get everyone promoted or to obtain the clearest picture of everyone’s record so that we feel confident in making firm decisions on the marginal cases. That decision has a great effect on the faculty expectations of the process, both from the perspective of the candidates, and of the faculty in the units who we rely on to help construct the dossiers and administer P&T.

Recommendations

Most of the issues below refer to proposed changes in practice – how we might better implement our guidelines to obtain more consistent outcomes for P&T – and to get what the faculty and university administration expect out of the process.

Service – see specific recommendations above – in addition, we recommend that service duties be documented in dossiers using outcome-based metrics. Specifically, candidates should discuss what they accomplished on each of the committees, etc., where they served. For candidates where service was an

important part of their record, specific effort should be made to document the outcome of their work – pro or con.

3rd year review – One of the most obvious outcomes from our observations was the significance of the mid-term review. Unfortunately, there are no current standards for that review, either with respect to the format of the information, nor to its timing. We recommend that be formalized to be similar to the P&T dossier, but without external letters (unless one such letter would provide helpful information for the review).

The timing of the review is critical. A review should take place at the end of the 3rd year, and need not happen during the normal P&T cycle. Therefore, it could begin after the 7th quarter of employment. Our observations (and our observations from other years) indicate a bad outcome can very often be traced to a delay in the review.

Quantitative review of P&T – One of the concerns that has arisen within the committee has been the number of individual, focused studies of P&T processes that have been conducted over the past couple of years. Many of these are being done within colleges, or by individual interest groups – with the best of interests. However, when an individual group conducts such a study, they have neither the resources nor the perspective necessary. The result can be a series of reports that are used to modify some of our critical processes – reports that are created with flawed data and interpreted without consideration for all of the variables that may be driving the system.

Promotion and tenure is one of the most important functions the university performs. It is worth our time, resources and a sustained effort to maintain an open database on what we are doing and how effective our process is (and how we would judge “effectiveness”). Towards that end, our committee recommends that the university undertake a quantitative study of the outcomes of promotion and tenure over the past several years. This study should not be specifically focused on any particular group, but should include the candidate’s discipline, their department, their position (tenure track, senior research, FRA), their distribution of work (e.g. % teaching, service, research, ...), location (on campus, off campus), group (gender, etc), and what the decision was at each level.

University wide metrics – Academic Affairs should take leadership in setting basic, university wide metrics for the duties as set in position descriptions. Specifically, some baseline for the distribution of work with respect to teaching should also be set. It is inherently unfair for some faculty to get 40% FTE credit for teaching 2 graduate courses in one unit and others to only get 50% FTE credit for teaching 6 large undergraduate courses in another.

We do not think that a solution to this would need to formulaic. However, the inequities represented across our campus must be addressed.

This is in addition to the recommendation described above under “Role of separate documents on position description guidelines”.

Post-tenure review – Our committee recommends that a separate committee be set up to develop a new review system using a two negative PROF review trigger system. We had no specific recommendations as a group further than that the committee should evaluate a number of options. An effort should be made to support units who have been making an effort to develop post-tenure review processes, in spite of the flaws in the current system – perhaps by continuing to support their ongoing initiatives with specific faculty identified as needing help.

Topics for discussion for next year

Engagement and Outreach: what definitions do we use for these activities when writing position descriptions and where do they fall in the guidelines? What specifically do we mean by engagement at OSU – how broad is it within the system – does it include engineers who collaborate with industry?

Affirmative action and the fairness of P&T with respect to under-represented groups. This issue was raised by the AFAPC report, and by the discussion around the text proposed for the guidelines related to the composition of unit P&T committees. This is a case where the need is for a full, clear discussion of the specific issues, aided by good data on our current processes.

Library: Some of the issues are similar with respect to engagement and outreach above. However there are others of significance with regards to the nature of the metrics of scholarly authority.

Flexible timeline for tenure: use of a longer timeline for disciplines where it is appropriate (already the case for COAS). Very preliminary discussion in some areas of Chem, Geo, Pharm.

Other – Input to Distance Education Committee

Our committee was asked last year for input on the role of distance education courses on P&T. Our feedback is part of the minutes of their committee report. In short however, our group provided input late last year (AY2005-6) and early this year to the effect that faculty should be rewarded for teaching distance education courses in the same way they are rewarded for teaching face to face courses. That should be based on their level of effort and the learning outcomes.

Final note on accountability for service: When I met with the executive committee at the beginning of the year, we discussed methods by which we could make faculty more accountable for their service. At that

time, I suggested that committee chairs report on the activity of each of their committee members. I will be sending in a separate report to that effect, but hope that you can follow up with all committees to get equivalent information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2006 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee began its review of 103 dossiers in March and concluded its final meeting on May 12, 2006. 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-two individuals were promoted to Professor; 3 to Professor, Senior Research; 2 to Professor, Courtesy, 32 to Associate Professor, 2 to Associate Professor, Senior Research; and 20 to Senior Faculty Research Assistant. Forty-one individuals were granted indefinite tenure. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee consisted of the following individuals:

- John Cassady, Vice President for Research
- Sally Francis, Dean, Graduate School
- Becky Johnson, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs & International Programs
- Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President
- Scott Reed, Vice Provost for University Outreach and Engagement, Director of OSU Extension Service

Faculty Observers to the 2005-2006 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, CHAIR
- Farah Ibrahim, College of Education
- Janet Lee, Department of Women's Studies
- Roger Nielsen, Department of Geosciences
- Jun Xing, Department of Ethnic Studies

ANALYSIS BY RANK AND TENURE

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	8	0	n/a	n/a
Senior Instructor	7	1	0	0
Associate Professor, Clinical	1	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor, Courtesy	1	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor, Senior Research	1	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor	46	5	45	5
Professor	25	1	2	0
No change in rank	n/a	n/a	7	0
Total	89	7	54	5

ANALYSIS FOR FEMALES

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied

Senior Faculty Research Assistant	4	0	n/a	n/a
Senior Instructor	3	0	0	0
Associate Professor, Clinical	0	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor, Courtesy	0	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor, Senior Research	1	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor	20	4	19	4
Professor	8	0	0	0
No change in rank	n/a	n/a	2	0
Associate Professor	36	4	21	4

ANALYSIS FOR MINORITIES

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	1	0	n/a	n/a
Senior Instructor	0	0	0	0
Associate Professor, Clinical	0	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor, Courtesy	0	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor, Senior Research	0	0	n/a	n/a
Associate Professor	9	1	9	1
Professor	4	0	0	0
No change in rank	n/a	n/a	1	0
Total	14	1	10	1

GRANTED INDEFINITE TENURE

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	19	6	2
Education	4	4	0
Engineering	6	0	4
Forestry	5	1	0
Health and Human Sciences	3	2	0
Liberal Arts	9	5	3
Library	0	0	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	2	0	0
Pharmacy	0	0	0
Science	6	3	1
Total	54	21	10

PROMOTION TO SENIOR FACULTY RESEARCH ASSISTANT

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	3	2	1
Engineering	2	0	0

Forestry	1	0	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	1	1	0
Science	1	1	0
Total	8	4	1

PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	1	0	0
Education	1	1	0
Engineering	1	0	0
Forestry	1	0	0
Health and Human Sciences	2	2	0
Science	1	0	0
Total	7	3	0

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, CLINICAL

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Pharmacy	1	0	0
Total	1	0	0

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, COURTESY

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	1	0	0
Total	1	0	0

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SENIOR RESEARCH

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	1	1	0
Total	1	1	0

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	17	5	2
Education	4	4	0
Engineering	4	0	3
Forestry	4	1	0
Health and Human Sciences	3	2	0
Liberal Arts	10	6	3
Science	4	2	1

Total	46	20	9
--------------	-----------	-----------	----------

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	5	1	1
Education	1	1	0
Engineering	2	0	1
Forestry	3	2	0
Health and Human Sciences	1	0	0
Liberal Arts	5	2	2
Library	1	1	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	2	0	0
Science	5	1	0
Total	25	8	4

| [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](#).